



Library of

Wellesley



College.

Purchased from  
The Horsford Fund.

No 63432









HISTORY OF THE POPES.

VOL. VIII.



THE  
HISTORY OF THE POPES,

FROM THE CLOSE OF THE MIDDLE AGES.

DRAWN FROM THE SECRET ARCHIVES OF THE VATICAN AND OTHER  
ORIGINAL SOURCES.

FROM THE GERMAN OF

DR. LUDWIG PASTOR,

PROFESSOR OF HISTORY IN THE UNIVERSITY OF INNSBRUCK, AND  
DIRECTOR OF THE AUSTRIAN HISTORICAL INSTITUTE IN ROME.

EDITED BY

RALPH FRANCIS KERR

OF THE LONDON ORATORY.

VOLUME VIII.

LONDON:

KEGAN PAUL, TRENCH, TRÜBNER & CO., LD.,  
DRYDEN HOUSE, GERRARD STREET.

1908.



63432

BX  
955  
.p35  
8



## CONTENTS OF VOL. VIII.

	PAGE
Table of Contents . . . . .	vii
List of Unpublished Documents in Appendix . . .	xxiii
LEO X., 1513-1521. BOOK II.	
Alliance of the Pope with the Emperor Charles V. . .	1-40
Defeat of the French and increase of the States of the Church. Death of Leo X. . . . .	41-70
Personality and manner of life of Leo X. His Finances and Court . . . . .	71-125
Medicean Rome . . . . .	126-182
The Renaissance in the field of Literature. Bembo and Sadoletto. Vida and Sannazaro . . . . .	183-241
Study of Antiquity. Raphael and the Plan of Ancient Rome. Encouragement of the Study of Greek. The Vatican Library and the Roman University . .	242-280
Leo X. as the Patron of the Arts. The Stanze, Tapestries, and Loggie of Raphael . . . . .	281-347
Leo X. and Michael Angelo. Promotion of the Minor Arts. The building of new St. Peter's. The pre- servation of Roman Antiquities . . . . .	348-383
The Council of the Lateran . . . . .	384-413
The French Concordat. Ecclesiastical Policy. Char- acter and Pontificate of Leo X. . . . .	414-461
Appendix of Unpublished Documents . . . . .	463-511
Index of Names . . . . .	513-525





# TABLE OF CONTENTS OF VOLUME VIII.

## CHAPTER I.

### ALLIANCE OF THE POPE WITH THE EMPEROR CHARLES V.\*

A.D.		PAGE
1519	The Pope fears the ascendancy of the Emperor . . . . .	1
	His idea of an anti-Imperial league . . . . .	2
	In September he makes a secret treaty with Francis I. . . . .	3
1520	The Pope instigates an attack on Ferrara . . . . .	4
	And represses the tyrants of the Marches . . . . .	4
	Giampaolo Baglioni summoned to Rome . . . . .	5
	His trial and execution on June 2nd . . . . .	7
	Manuel arrives in Rome as Ambassador from the Emperor on April 11th . . . . .	9
	First disturbance in the relations with France . . . . .	9
	Pretensions and encroachments of Francis I. . . . .	10
	Who forbids the proclamation of the Bull of Maundy Thursday . . . . .	11
	And opposes the elevation of de la Mark to the Cardinalate . . . . .	12
	The Pope proposes the elevation to the purple of Jean d'Orléans . . . . .	12
	Francis makes a grievance even of this . . . . .	13
	Anger of the Pope . . . . .	13
	Who resolves to drive the French out of Italy . . . . .	14
	And decides to take 6000 Swiss into his service . . . . .	15
	He also sends draft of a new alliance to the Emperor . . . . .	15
	Francis I. makes proposals to the Pope . . . . .	15
	But is not sincere in so doing . . . . .	16
	The Pope's negotiations with Manuel on December 11th . . . . .	16
1521	He succeeds in coming to an agreement with both Charles and Francis . . . . .	17

\* Unpublished documents are marked by an asterisk (\*); documents to be published in "Acta Pontificum Romanorum" are designated by two asterisks (\*\*).

A.D.		PAGE
1521	The insincerity of Francis drives the Pope towards the Emperor . . . . .	17
	As does also the Lutheran movement in Germany . . . . .	18
	Where so much depends upon the attitude of the Emperor . . . . .	18
	Concessions of the Pope to Charles V. . . . .	19
	The reports of Aleander from Germany . . . . .	21
	The Emperor formally requested (January 18th) to publish the Bull against Luther . . . . .	22
	A Consistory held (February 6th) for dealing with the "two conflagrations" . . . . .	23
	The Pope now devotes much time to the Lutheran affair . . . . .	24
	And writes to the German Princes . . . . .	25
	The decision to summon Luther to the Diet . . . . .	26
	This is complained of at the Consistory on the 20th of March . . . . .	27
	Instructions sent to the Legates in Germany . . . . .	28
	Great anxiety of the Pope (April) . . . . .	29
	Who sends for Manuel and speaks strongly to him . . . . .	30
	The loyalty of the Emperor . . . . .	31
	Causes great satisfaction in Rome (May) . . . . .	32
	Proposed alliance of the Pope and the Emperor against France . . . . .	33
	Hesitation of the Pope . . . . .	34
	The French go too far, and the alliance is concluded on May 8th . . . . .	35
	The conditions of this alliance are favourable to the Holy See . . . . .	36
	Thanks of the Pope conveyed to the Emperor, and Luther's writings burned in Rome . . . . .	37
	Zeal of Aleander . . . . .	38
	Spread of the new doctrines in Saxony . . . . .	38
	Edicts against Luther's works . . . . .	39
	Henry VIII. writes against him . . . . .	40

## CHAPTER II.

## DEFEAT OF THE FRENCH AND INCREASE OF THE STATES OF THE CHURCH.—DEATH OF LEO X.

1521	Commencement of hostilities ; Papal attempts against Ferrara . . . . .	41
	Which fail, as do those to stir up an insurrection against the French in Milan . . . . .	42

## TABLE OF CONTENTS.

ix

A.D.		PAGE
1521	The attack on Papal territory causes the Pope to declare himself (June 27th) openly against France . . . . .	43
	And to make preparations for the expulsion of the French from Italy . . . . .	44
	Composition of the allied army . . . . .	45
	Francis I. endeavours to win back the Pope, but fails (August) Boasts that he will enter Rome and impose laws on the Pope . . . . .	46
	Charles V. urges the Pope to excommunicate Francis And informs him of his first move against France .	47
	(Sept. 4th) The Pope threatens the French with excommunication and interdict . . . . .	48
	His reasons for this . . . . .	49
	Difficulties with the Swiss, whose conduct causes the allies to retreat from Parma . . . . .	49
	Filonardi and Schinner succeed in getting together more Swiss troops . . . . .	50
	Who advance into Italy and join the allies . . . . .	52
	And are recruited by deserters from the French . . . . .	53
	Milan and the whole of Lombardy conquered . . . . .	54
	Joy of the Pope at hearing this . . . . .	55
	As his position was critical on account of the expenses of the war . . . . .	56
	The Pope taken ill (October 25th) . . . . .	57
	Convalescent on November the 5th, and goes to Magliana . . . . .	58
	Intelligence reaches him there (November 24th) of the defeat of the French . . . . .	58
	Meets with an enthusiastic reception on his return to Rome (November 25th) . . . . .	59
	And talks about a public thanksgiving . . . . .	60
	Is taken ill again on November 26th. . . . .	61
	On December 1st learns that Parma has been taken .	62
	Receives Extreme Unction and dies at midnight .	63
	Consternation of the friends of the Medici . . . . .	64
	Precautionary measures taken by the Sacred College .	65
	Suspensions of poison . . . . .	66
	Opinions on this of Vettori, Guicciardini and Giovio .	67
	Most probably the Pope died from malaria . . . . .	68
	Extravagant attacks on his memory . . . . .	68
	Buried very poorly . . . . .	69
	The tomb erected for him by Paul III. in S. Maria sopra Minerva . . . . .	69



## CHAPTER III.

PERSONALITY AND MANNER OF LIFE OF LEO X.—HIS FINANCES  
AND COURT.

A.D.		PAGE
	Outward appearance of Leo X. far from attractive . . .	71
	His musical and pleasant voice, and manner, majestic but full of charm . . . . .	72
	The portrait of Leo X. by Raphael in the Pitti Gallery . . . . .	73
	His character as described by Marino Giorgi . . .	75
	His words, "Let us enjoy the Papacy, etc.," rest on no authentic tradition . . . . .	76
	His determination to maintain the strong position of the Holy See . . . . .	77
	Enjoys to the full the highly developed culture of his age with unembarrassed light-heartedness . . .	77
	His high culture and receptivity of all that is beautiful . . .	78
	Exact in the fulfilment of all religious duties . . .	78
	Testimony to the undoubted piety of Leo X. . . .	79
	The spotlessness of his morals . . . . .	80
	And great benevolence—scarcely a work of Christian charity he does not support . . . . .	81
	His activity in redeeming Christian slaves . . . .	82
	His tact and amiability in intercourse with others . . .	83
	Yet in political matters could be very severe . . .	83
	His prudence in critical moments . . . . .	84
	Double-dealing policy of the Pope . . . . .	84
	Notably in his negotiations with Charles V. and Francis I. . . . .	85
	His delight in following political "crooked paths" . . .	86
	And in keeping his plans secret . . . . .	87
1513	At first Bibbiena is the Pope's confidant . . . .	87
1517	Then Giulio de' Medici . . . . .	87
	Who in important affairs is the ruling spirit . . .	88
	But has to take the Pope's opinion on all matters . . .	89
	Important business with Ambassadors carried on by the Pope in person . . . . .	89
	The Pope's pleasure in giving, leads him into wanton extravagance . . . . .	90
	And to squander the savings of his predecessor . . .	90
1513	Ponzetti becomes Papal Treasurer . . . . .	91
	Methods tried to procure money . . . . .	91
	Financial ruin, the result of the Urbino war . . .	92
	The accounts books of Serapica . . . . .	93
	Giorgi's estimate of the Papal revenue . . . . .	95

# TABLE OF CONTENTS.

xi

A.D.	PAGE
1513	Revenue from proceeds of saleable offices . . . 96
	And other sources . . . 97
	Sums paid by Cibo and Armellini for the office of Camerlengo . . . 98
	Taxes in the States of the Church remain low . . . 99
1521	Great difficulty in raising money for the war against France . . . 100
	Financial crisis brought about by the death of Leo, and many of his friends are ruined . . . 101
	The Florentines largely responsible for the enormous Papal expenditure . . . 102
	They inundate Rome and their greediness is boundless 103
	They obtain many lucrative financial posts . . . 104
	All the great families of Florence represented in the Papal "Famiglia" . . . 105
	Florentines in the service of the Pope as poets, artists, etc. . . . 106
	And many hold military and diplomatic appointments 107
	And Nunciatures . . . . 108
	The Pope's relatives . . . . 108
	Card. Bibbiena—his friendship with Leo X. . . . 110
1516	Sent as Legate to the Emperor, and later to Francis I. 111
	His character and tastes . . . . 112
	Friends of the Pope among the younger Cardinals . . 113
	Many prelates patronize art and literature . . . 115
	The Roman nobles, with few exceptions, are not distinguished . . . . 116
	The banker Agostino Chigi—his fabulous fortune . . 117
	And generous patronage of art . . . . 118
	Raphael executes many works for him . . . . 119
	Other bankers in Rome . . . . 120
	Bindo Altoviti—his portrait by Raphael . . . . 121
1519	The banquet given by Lorenzo Strozzi . . . . 122
	Corruption of Roman society . . . . 123
	Which is pre-eminently cosmopolitan . . . . 124
	Satire by Ariosto on the Curia . . . . 125

## CHAPTER IV.

### MEDICEAN ROME.

Extraordinary development of the city . . . .	126
Important improvements promoted by the Pope . .	127
Description by the Venetian Ambassador . . . .	128
The Leonine city—Palaces of the Cardinals . . .	129

A.D.		PAGE
	Many new buildings erected, remarkable for their beauty . . . . .	131
	The Trastevere retains its mediæval character . . . .	132
	State of the Ruins of ancient Rome . . . . .	133
	The Forum, Capitol, and the Palatine . . . . .	134
	Old St. Peter's . . . . .	135
	Beauty and splendour of the Vatican . . . . .	136
	Sculpture in the Belvedere. The Pope's menagerie .	137
	The pilgrimage to the Seven Churches . . . . .	137
	Pesaro's report of the Roman Antiquities . . . . .	138
	Alberto Pio di Carpi and Baldassare Castiglione .	139
	Rome becomes the centre of European culture. Opinion of Erasmus . . . . .	140
	However great the evil in society, still there is not a little of what was good. Sadoleto . . . . .	141
	The mode of life and occupations of Leo X. . . . .	142
	His great temperance and fasts . . . . .	143
	His great love of music . . . . .	144
	Number of musicians at the Papal court . . . . .	145
	Perfection of the Papal choir . . . . .	147
	Next to music, improvisation most appreciated . .	149
	The improvisatori, Tebaldeo, Accolti, Strascino, etc. .	149
	Professional jesters and buffoons . . . . .	151
	Fra Mariano . . . . .	152
	Camillo Querno—ridicule cast upon his vanity . .	153
	Baraballo of Gaeta—cruel farce played on him . .	154
	Harm caused by this love for buffoonery . . . . .	156
	Fondness of the Pope for the pleasures of the chase .	157
	Description of his hunting-ground . . . . .	158
	Scandal caused by this . . . . .	160
	Description of a hunt by Giovio . . . . .	161
	Postumo and Paris de Grassis, on the Pope's dress for a hunting expedition . . . . .	162
	Kindness and affability of the Pope to the poor on these occasions—they greet him with joy . . . .	163
	Life of Leo X. when at Magliana . . . . .	164
	Description of the castle . . . . .	165
	And its neighbourhood . . . . .	166
	Magnificence of the pageants held in Rome . . . .	167
1513	The conferring of the Roman Patriciate on the Pope's nephews (September 13th and 14th) . . .	167
	The ceremonial for this is repeated at the Vatican for the pleasure of the Pope (September 18th) .	169
1519	Leo watches the Carnival from the Loggia of St. Angelo . . . . .	170
	And is present at Ariosto's comedy "Suppositi" .	171



A.D.		PAGE
1519	Description of this scene by Paolucci . . . . .	172
	Bull-fight in the Piazza of St. Peter's . . . . .	173
	Scandal given by the plays of Ariosto . . . . .	173
1520	Notwithstanding the grave outlook, the Carnival takes place with its wonted brilliancy . . . . .	174
	The great triumphal procession through Rome . . . . .	175
1521	The Pope again at St. Angelo for the Carnival— and witnesses the "Moresca" dance . . . . .	176
	Description of this by Castiglione . . . . .	176
	Meanwhile opposition to the Papacy to the north of the Alps daily increases . . . . .	177
	Opinions of Machiavelli and Vettori . . . . .	178
	Violent accusations by Guicciardini . . . . .	178
1520	The Dialogue of Bartolomeo Cerretani . . . . .	179
	Complaints of Salomoni and Tizio, who, however, take up a sound Catholic position . . . . .	180
	The Italians draw a clear line between persons and offices, and do not even contemplate a breach with the Papacy . . . . .	181

## CHAPTER V.

THE RENAISSANCE IN THE FIELD OF LITERATURE.—BEMBO  
AND SADOLETO.—VIDA AND SANNAZARO.

1513	The election of Leo hailed by the whole educated world . . . . .	183
	His first acts. Eminent Latinists summoned to Rome. Foundation of a College for the study of Greek . . . . .	184
	Generosity to poets and learned men . . . . .	185
	Who flock to Rome as to their mother country . . . . .	186
	Events celebrated by the new Latin poetry . . . . .	187
	The poets pursue the Pope everywhere; he is unable to satisfy them all . . . . .	188
	Favourite meeting-places of the Roman poets . . . . .	189
	The collections of poems by Palladio and Arsilli . . . . .	190
	Bembo and Sadoletto hold the first place as writers of both prose and poetry . . . . .	191
	An appreciation of Bembo . . . . .	192
	The Pope confides to him the composition of the Papal letters . . . . .	193
	Vast extent of Bembo's private correspondence . . . . .	194
	His Latin letters . . . . .	195
	His prominent position at the court of Leo X. . . . .	195

A.D.		PAGE
1520	He leaves Rome . . . . .	196
	Position and tastes of Sadoletto . . . . .	197
	His religious spirit and disinterestedness . . . . .	198
	The Pope refuses to part with him . . . . .	198
	Character of Sadoletto's writings. His friends . . . . .	199
	Vida and his poem the "Christiade" . . . . .	200
	An appreciation of this work . . . . .	201
	Sannazaro and his epic on The Nativity of Christ . . . . .	202
1521	Is requested by Leo to publish this . . . . .	204
	After the Pope's death he attacks his memory . . . . .	204
	The humanists Fracastoro and Spagnolo Mantovano . . . . .	205
	The "Calendar of Feasts" of Mantovano . . . . .	206
1519	Zaccaria Ferreri employed by the Pope . . . . .	208
	His work in the reform of the Breviary . . . . .	209
	Character of the changes made by Ferreri in the hymns . . . . .	210
	The other poets at the Court of Leo X. . . . .	211
	Casanova and Muzzarelli . . . . .	213
	Jano Vitale, Acciaiuoli, and Postumo . . . . .	214
	Antonio Tebaldeo of Ferrara . . . . .	215
	The German poets, friends of Goritz . . . . .	216
	Rome inundated with good and bad poems, odes, etc. . . . .	216
	Writers of Italian poetry — Bembo, Molza, and Accolti . . . . .	217
	Pietro Aretino and Agostino Beazzano . . . . .	218
	The "Sofonisba" of Trissino. Giovanni Rucellai . . . . .	219
	Ariosto disappointed at his reception by Leo X. . . . .	220
	Cultivation of rhetoric . . . . .	221
	Qualities required in orations and sermons . . . . .	222
	Discourses by the humanists Equicola and Valeriano . . . . .	223
1521	The oration on the History of Rome (April 21st) . . . . .	225
	The leading orators in Rome . . . . .	227
1516	Arrival in Rome of Longueil. Two bitterly opposed parties spring up . . . . .	228
	Celso Mellini and the attack on Longueil . . . . .	229
1519	Who is cited before the Senate on the charge of high treason. His trial . . . . .	230
1520	Receives the freedom of the city—Writes against Luther. Dies in September 1522 . . . . .	233
	"Pasquino": its festival on St. Mark's day . . . . .	234
	The satires and pasquinades — many of them couched in bitter language . . . . .	235
	Strong influence of classical antiquity . . . . .	235
	The Historians—Guicciardini . . . . .	236
	Machiavelli—his ideas . . . . .	236

A.D.		PAGE
1520	His relations with the Medici . . . . .	237
	Paolo Giovio and his friend Sanuto . . . . .	238
	The History of Giovio—judgments passed upon it . . . . .	239
	Its value for this period of Papal history . . . . .	240

## CHAPTER VI.

STUDY OF ANTIQUITY.—RAPHAEL AND THE PLAN OF ANCIENT  
ROME.—ENCOURAGEMENT OF THE STUDY OF GREEK.—THE  
VATICAN LIBRARY AND THE ROMAN UNIVERSITY.

	Latino Giovenale Manetti and his collection of statues . . . . .	242
	The first collection of inscriptions published by Mazocchi . . . . .	242
	Albertini's work on the "Marvels of Rome" . . . . .	243
	The work of Valeriano on the Obelisks in Rome . . . . .	243
	The works of Andrea Fulvio . . . . .	244
	Services he renders to Raphael . . . . .	244
	Who in his company visits the remains of ancient Rome . . . . .	244
	Letter by Raphael to the Pope on the antiquities of Rome . . . . .	245
	And appeal for their preservation . . . . .	246
	Raphael's intention to make a plan of ancient Rome . . . . .	247
	Great interest aroused by this . . . . .	249
1520	He dies before its completion . . . . .	249
	Philosophical works of Nifo and Pico della Mirandola . . . . .	250
	The work of Egidio Canisio on the Philosophy of History . . . . .	250
	Leo Africanus, the geographer . . . . .	251
	Theological writers: Fiandino, Catarino, Cajetan, and others . . . . .	252
	Alberto Pio di Carpi and Erasmus . . . . .	253
	Abject servility of Erasmus . . . . .	253
	He dedicates to the Pope his St. Jerome and Greek New Testament. Dispensations granted to him . . . . .	254
	Assures Leo X. of his loyalty in the affair of Luther . . . . .	255
	Aleander accuses him of encouraging errors . . . . .	256
	Erasmus writes again to the Pope to defend himself . . . . .	256
1521	Who urges him to use his talents in combating Lutheran doctrine . . . . .	257
	Was Erasmus treated with too much consideration? . . . . .	257
	Protection extended by the Pope to the press of Aldus Manutius . . . . .	257
	Greek books printed by Aldus . . . . .	258

A.D.		PAGE
1513	Revival of Greek Studies. Lascaris and Musurus called to Rome by Leo X. . . . .	259
1516	And teach Greek in the College founded by the Pope for that end . . . . .	260
	Causes of the failure of the Greek College . . . . .	261
	Some of the works that issued from its press . . . . .	262
	The Pope's support of the study of Oriental languages . . . . .	262
	The Library of Leo X. : its custodians . . . . .	263
	Inghirami and Beroaldo . . . . .	264
1519	Acciaiuoli and Aleander—satisfaction caused by the appointment of the latter as librarian . . . . .	265
	Efforts of the Pope to add to the Library . . . . .	266
	The literary mission of Johann Heitmers . . . . .	267
	His powers and instructions . . . . .	268
	Leo X. on the advancement of learning . . . . .	269
	The large number of writings dedicated to him . . . . .	270
	Additions to the Vatican Library not so great as might have been expected : reason for this . . . . .	271
1513	The Papal Constitution of November 5th on reforms for the Roman University . . . . .	272
	Professorial chairs of the University . . . . .	273
	Some of the more celebrated professors—their salaries . . . . .	274
	Rivalry of the University of Pisa—to which some of the professors migrate . . . . .	274
	Cause of the downfall of the Roman University—partly financial . . . . .	275
	Direct results of the literary influence of Leo X. much over-estimated . . . . .	277
	Literary dilettantism its prevailing feature . . . . .	278
	The intellectual atmosphere created in Rome by Leo X. . . . .	279

## CHAPTER VII

### LEO X. AS THE PATRON OF THE ARTS.—THE STANZE, TAPESTRIES AND LOGGIE OF RAPHAEL.

1513	The reign of Leo opens a new epoch in the career of Raphael . . . . .	281
	The pupils of Raphael, Giov. Franc. Penni and Giulio Romano . . . . .	282
	The decorations of the Stanze . . . . .	283
	The frescoes of the third Stanza, "del Incendio" . . . . .	284
	Portion of this work executed by Penni and G. Romano . . . . .	287



A.D.		PAGE
1513	Subjects of these frescoes . . . . .	288
	The allusion in them to events of the time . . . . .	288
	The Cartoons for the tapestries . . . . .	294
	Price paid by the Pope for each cartoon . . . . .	294
1517	The tapestries executed in Brussels . . . . .	295
	Cost of the tapestries . . . . .	295
1519	Three of the hangings arrive in Rome; they excite unmixed admiration . . . . .	296
	Vasari's opinion of them . . . . .	297
	Vicissitudes of the tapestries . . . . .	298
	The cartoons . . . . .	300
	The second series of tapestries . . . . .	303
	And the cartoons for them . . . . .	306
	In many respects they show Raphael at his best . . . . .	315
	Influence of the tapestries on later art . . . . .	315
	Raphael's third great work: the decoration of the Vatican Loggie (1513-1519) . . . . .	317
	Description of this by Marcantonio Michiel . . . . .	319
	Scheme of the decoration . . . . .	320
	Share of Raphael's pupils in the work . . . . .	322
	Especially of Giovanni da Udine . . . . .	323
	Character of his work . . . . .	326
	Its clever combination of painting and stucco . . . . .	327
	And the way in which nature, as well as the antique, is drawn upon . . . . .	328
	Allusions in the decorations to the favourite pursuits of Leo X. . . . .	329
	The alliance in them between Christian and pagan art . . . . .	330
	Work of Perino del Vaga and Giovanni da Udine in the Borgia apartments . . . . .	332
	Concurrently with these tasks, Raphael executes a number of commissions for Bibbiena and Chigi . . . . .	332
	The Sixtine Madonna . . . . .	333
	The Transfiguration . . . . .	336
	Part of which is the work of Giulio Romano . . . . .	337
	Connection of this picture with the efforts to promote a Crusade . . . . .	338
1520	Raphael dies (April 6th) when he has only partly finished the picture . . . . .	339
	Grief felt at his death . . . . .	340
	His burial in S. Maria ad Martyres . . . . .	341
1513	Leonardo da Vinci comes to Rome . . . . .	341
	But leaves there no trace of his art . . . . .	342
1514	Fra Bartolommeo in Rome, but returns to Florence after a few months . . . . .	342

A.D.		PAGE
1514	Work executed in Rome by Soddoma and others . . . . .	343
	Sebastiano del Piombo tries to belittle Raphael . . . . .	343
	To whom the Pope remains loyal . . . . .	344
	Paintings executed by del Piombo in Rome . . . . .	344
	His ambition at the death of Raphael . . . . .	345
	At last he succeeds in gaining an audience of the Pope . . . . .	345
1520	Account of this interview, in a letter to Michael Angelo (October 15th) . . . . .	346
	The Pope leaves the work at the Vatican in the hands of Raphael's pupils . . . . .	347

## CHAPTER VIII.

LEO X. AND MICHAEL ANGELO.—PROMOTION OF THE MINOR ARTS.  
—THE BUILDING OF NEW ST. PETER'S.—THE PRESERVATION  
OF ROMAN ANTIQUITIES.

	Misrepresentation of the relations of Michael Angelo with Leo X. . . . .	348
1516	He undertakes the work of the façade of the church of S. Lorenzo in Florence . . . . .	349
	In addition to the monument to Julius II. . . . .	349
1517	Visits Carrara to choose marbles. This prevents him fulfilling his contract . . . . .	350
1520	Which is cancelled . . . . .	350
	Resentment of Michael Angelo removed by the Pope's proposal for work in the sacristy of S. Lorenzo . . . . .	351
	Work of Sansovino at Loreto . . . . .	351
	Works of sculpture under Leo X. . . . .	352
	Development of plastic decoration . . . . .	353
	Woodwork and intarsia . . . . .	353
	Manufactories of majolica ware. Number of goldsmiths employed by Leo X. . . . .	354
	His wealth of precious stones . . . . .	355
	The art of cutting gems. Designers of medals . . . . .	356
	The architectural task bequeathed by Julius II. to his successor . . . . .	356
	The new buildings in the States of the Church . . . . .	357
	Rebuilding and restorations undertaken by Leo X. in Rome . . . . .	358
	The condition of St. Peter's . . . . .	359
1513	Bramante, Fra Giocondo, and G. di Sangallo, architects for the building. Death of Bramante (January 14th, 1514) . . . . .	360

A.D.		PAGE
1514	He is succeeded by Raphael (April 1st) . . . .	361
1515	Death of Fra Giocondo (July 1st). Raphael becomes sole architect-in-chief of St. Peter's . . . .	364
	The plans of Bramante and Raphael . . . .	365
	Inconsiderable results attained by Raphael . . . .	367
1520	He is succeeded by Antonio di Sangallo . . . .	367
	Difficulties in raising money for the work . . . .	367
	The financial disorder brings the work to a standstill .	369
	Raphael employed on other architectural commissions	370
	The Villa Madama for Cardinal Medici . . . .	370
	Increasing interest in Roman antiquities . . . .	372
1515	Brief of Leo X. to Raphael on the subject . . . .	373
	The Pope expressly commands the preservation of all inscriptions . . . . .	373
	Archæological discoveries during his pontificate . .	374
	The Papal collection of antiquities . . . . .	375
	Leo X. contrasted with Julius II. as a patron of art .	376
	The preference of Leo X. for decorative art . . . .	379
	Great service rendered to art by his employment of Raphael . . . . .	381
	Influence of Leo X. on culture . . . . .	383

## CHAPTER IX.

## THE COUNCIL OF THE LATERAN.

	The ecclesiastical government of Leo X. . . . .	384
1513	He proclaims his intention of proceeding with the Lateran Council. The Sixth Session opens on April 27th . . . . .	385
	The Pope calls upon the members to fix their atten- tion first on the good of Christendom . . . .	386
	Formation of the Congregations . . . . .	386
	The Seventh Session (June 17th, 1513). The Pope proposes to send embassies of peace to the princes . . . . .	387
	Decree of September 20th relating to the Hussites .	388
	The Eighth Session (December 19th, 1513) . . . .	388
	The three condemned propositions . . . . .	389
	Directed against a paganized humanism . . . .	390
	Proposal for a reform of the Curia . . . . .	391
1514	The Ninth Session (May 5th, 1514) . . . . .	391
	The stringent Bull on the reform of Church and Curia	392
	Most of its prescriptions remain on paper . . . .	393
	The quarrel between Bishops and Regulars . . . .	393

A.D.		PAGE
1514	Successful mediation of the Pope . . . . .	394
	Answer of the Regulars to the attack of the Bishops .	395
1515	The Tenth Session (May 4th, 1515). Still the cry for reform. Strengthening of the authority of Bishops . . . . .	396
	Sanction given to the Monti di Pietà . . . . .	397
	Regulations for the printing of books . . . . .	398
	The question of a reform of the Calendar . . . . .	398
	But no decision reached on this matter . . . . .	399
	Proposal of many of the Bishops to unite in a sodality. Their object in this proposal . . . . .	400
	Which is absolutely refused by the Pope . . . . .	401
1516	The Eleventh Session (December 19th, 1516). It witnesses the first appearance of an American Bishop . . . . .	402
	The Patriarch of the Maronites sends his homage .	402
	Æthiopia and Russia . . . . .	403
	Concordat with France and repeal of the Pragmatic Sanction . . . . .	403
	The Constitution on preaching . . . . .	404
1517	Discussion in Consistory (February 1st) on the closing of the Council . . . . .	405
	Remarkable speech on reform by Gianfrancesco Pico della Mirandola in the presence of the Council . . . . .	406
	The Twelfth and final Session closed on March 16th.	408
	A short review of the history and purpose of the Council . . . . .	408
	Was the closing premature? . . . . .	409
	Nature of the decrees of the Lateran Council . . .	410
	Many of them remain practically a dead letter . .	410
	Cardinal Medici holds a provincial council (1517- 1518) for Florence . . . . .	411
	But in Rome little is done . . . . .	412
1520	Letter of Alexander (December). . . . .	413

## CHAPTER X.

THE FRENCH CONCORDAT.—ECCLESIASTICAL POLICY.—  
CHARACTER AND PONTIFICATE OF LEO X.

1515	Conference between the Pope and Francis I. at Bologna . . . . .	414
	Who come to terms on the main article of the Con- cordat . . . . .	415



A.D.		PAGE
1515	The negotiations proceed with difficulty . . . . .	415
1516	The plenipotentiaries leave Bologna (February) . . . . .	415
	Concessions by the Pope. Series of stipulations not in the Concordat . . . . .	416
	Heavy sacrifices made by Leo X. to preserve France in the unity of the Church . . . . .	417
	Opposition to the Concordat in France and Rome . . . . .	417
	The Pope succeeds in securing the condemnation of the Pragmatic Sanction . . . . .	418
	Stipulations of the Concordat . . . . .	419
	And importance of its omissions . . . . .	420
1516	Ratified by the Pope on August 18th . . . . .	421
	The influence of the French king is now turned into a permanent system . . . . .	421
	The Concordat laid before the Lateran Council on December 19th . . . . .	422
	A few of the Bishops disapprove . . . . .	423
	Publication of the decree <i>Pastor Æternus</i> . . . . .	424
	Triumph of the Pope over the schismatic tendencies . . . . .	425
1517	The Parliament and University of Paris oppose the Concordat . . . . .	426
	As do also the provincial Parliaments . . . . .	427
	Remonstrance of the Paris Parliament . . . . .	427
1518	Francis I. remains firm, and Parliament registers the Concordat on March 22nd . . . . .	428
	The University appeals to a future Council. The King arrests some of the professors . . . . .	428
	Satisfaction in Rome at the firm attitude of Francis I. . . . .	429
	Bull against the appeal of the University (June 18th) . . . . .	429
	Papal edict against the Rector and University (June 25th) . . . . .	430
	But the opposition in France survives . . . . .	431
	Estimate of the loss and gain that accrue to the con- tracting parties of the Concordat . . . . .	431
	Increase of power given by it to the French King . . . . .	432
	Who distributes benefices without a thought as to merit . . . . .	433
	But the Concordat has its good side . . . . .	433
	By it the Kings of France have powerful motives for remaining Catholic . . . . .	434
	Concessions to Spain and Portugal . . . . .	435
1515	Dignities conferred on the boy Alfonso of Portugal, who is created Cardinal in 1517 . . . . .	436
	Acts of aggression on the part of many Italian States . . . . .	437
	Negotiations between Poland and Rome . . . . .	437
	The Archbishop of Gnesen made <i>legatus natus</i> . . . . .	438

A.D.		PAGE
1515	Relations of Leo X. with Henry VIII. Wolsey .	439
	Is created Cardinal ; his character and aims . .	440
1520	His legatine powers extended to two years . .	441
1521	Publication, in St. Paul's Churchyard, of the Brief against Luther . . . . .	441
	Henry VIII. sends to the Pope his work against Luther . . . . .	442
	And receives the title of "Defender of the Faith" .	444
	Protection given by Leo X. to the Jews . . .	445
	Canonization of Saints . . . . .	445
	Churches and devotions enriched by Indulgences .	446
	Protest of the Pope against slavery and injustice to the Indians . . . . .	447
	His attention to the churches of the East . . .	447
1514	Envoys sent to Russia . . . . .	448
	Dealings of the Pope with the Uniat Greeks . .	448
	Steps taken against fanatical preachers . . .	449
	Rome and the Church in Scandinavia . . . .	450
1516	The mission of Arcimboldi to Denmark . . .	451
1520	King Christian invades Sweden—his cruelty . .	452
	Sends to Germany for Lutheran theologians . .	453
	Seeks to establish a State Church in Denmark .	453
1521	Francesco de Potentia sent as Nuncio to Copenhagen	454
1522	He absolves Christian . . . . .	454
	Efforts of the Pope for monastic reform . . .	455
1517	His measures as regards the Franciscans . . .	456
	The forty-two Cardinals created by Leo X. . .	457
	Motives that guided him in these creations . .	458
	Leo X. "a true child of the Renaissance" . . .	459
	Judgment of his contemporaries . . . . .	460
	The Leonine Era . . . . .	461

# LIST OF UNPUBLISHED DOCUMENTS IN APPENDIX.

	PAGE
I. Leo X. to Cardinal Farnese . . . . .	465
II. „ to Bologna . . . . .	466
III. „ to the Duke Alfonso I. of Ferrara . . . . .	466
IV. „ to Pietro Bembo . . . . .	467
V. The “Oratory of Divine Love” . . . . .	469
VI. Alessandro Gabbioneta to the Marquis of Mantua . . . . .	470
VII. Leo X. to Francis I. of France . . . . .	470
VIII. Safe-conduct from Leo X. to Johann Heitmers . . . . .	471
IX. Antonio de Beatis to the Marchioness of Mantua . . . . .	473
X. Leo X. to Lorenzo de’ Medici . . . . .	473
XI. „ to Francesco da Ferrara . . . . .	475
XII. Baldassare Castiglione to the Marquis of Mantua . . . . .	475
XIII. „ „ „ . . . . .	476
XIV. „ „ „ . . . . .	476
XV. Ang. Germanello to the Marchioness of Mantua . . . . .	476
XVI. „ to the Marquis of Mantua . . . . .	478
XVII. „ to the Marchioness of Mantua . . . . .	478
XVIII. Fabrizio Pellegrino to the Marquis of Mantua . . . . .	479
XIX. Baldassare Castiglione to the Marquis of Mantua . . . . .	479
XX. „ „ „ . . . . .	480
XXI. Leo X. to Cardinal Giulio de’ Medici . . . . .	480
XXII. The “Leonine Letters” of P. Bembo . . . . .	482





## CHAPTER I.

### ALLIANCE OF THE POPE WITH THE EMPEROR CHARLES V.

WHILE the Emperor was issuing his Edict against Luther, his political alliance with the Pope was concluded. But many changes had taken place before this was accomplished.

Leo X. had been driven by sheer necessity to his final consent to the election of Charles to the Imperial throne; though, after his consent, he feared the Emperor's ascendancy more than ever. Charles and Francis were eager competitors for the favour of the Pope,\* whose partisanship was all-important to each in the approaching struggle, which was to be fought out principally in Italy. It seemed scarcely doubtful which side Leo X. would take; for, though originally his sympathies were with Spain, now the power of the Empire filled him with aversion and fear.†

To the Medici Pope, like so many of his predecessors, the idea of a supremacy, such as the Hohenstaufen had ere now striven for, was like a living nightmare. The necessity for the maintenance of the balance of power in Europe, by which alone the independence of the Holy See and the "liberty

\* Cf. the \*Letters of B. Castiglione to the Marquis of Mantua, Aug. 12, 27, 31, and Sept. 17, 1519. Gonzaga Archives, Mantua.

† "Il papa di natura sua è piu inclinato a Spagnoli che a Francesi, ma aborrisce et ha in odio et teme questo nome de imperatore, massimamente in questo che è tanto potente." B. Castiglione in a \*Letter dat. Rome, 1519, Sept. 10. Gonzaga Archives, Mantua.

of Italy" could be secured, drove Leo at once into the ranks of the enemies of the Hapsburg. Hence the plan of forestalling the Emperor's journey to Rome by aggression; hence the idea of a great anti-Imperial league with France, Venice, England, and the Swiss.\* England, however, showed no inclination to be drawn into any such alliance; consequently, a smaller league between the Pope, France, and Venice was contemplated. But as the two last-named powers cautiously held back, the Pope also withdrew, having no inclination to step alone into the breach.† He was, however, most eager to be on friendly terms with France, and in this wish there is no doubt that his designs on Ferrara played an obvious part. The suppression of the Duke, his insubordinate vassal, which had, ever since the time of Julius II., been an important item of the Papal policy, appeared to Leo to be more urgent than ever, because, not only at the time of the French invasion in 1515, but also during the war of Urbino, Duke Alfonso had made common cause with the enemies of the Holy See.‡ Moreover, the subjection of Ferrara appeared to be especially desirable at this juncture, for Leo X. was convinced that only by an increase of the States of the Church was an end to be put to the critical position they occupied between the two great powers of Europe. Conscious of his own weakness, no choice had been hitherto left to him except that of vacillating between these two powers, or of attaching himself to one of them, at the risk of being reduced to a state of servile dependence. After the possessions of the Church had been increased, on the

\* NITTI, 228 *seq.*, 234 *seq.*, and Reichstagsakten, II., 42.

† BAUMGARTEN, Karl V., I., 191.

‡ Cf. Vol. VII. of this work, p. 144, n., for the *Risposta alla invectiva*, B. 3 and 4.

death of Lorenzo, by the annexation of the Duchy of Urbino and Pesaro, the only thing wanting to enable the Holy See to defend itself from friend and foe alike was the acquisition of Ferrara.\*

Venice and France were the natural enemies of such a predominance of the States of the Church in Central Italy, and Alfonso knew very well that he could count on the assistance of both these powers. Nevertheless it now seemed as if France were willing to abandon so faithful and warlike an ally as Duke Alfonso. In September, 1519, a treaty, which was to be kept absolutely secret, was made between Leo and the new French Ambassador, Saint-Marceau, by which the former pledged himself to defend the interests of France with his weapons, both temporal and spiritual, and to refuse to Charles the investiture with the crown of Naples in conjunction with that of the Empire. On his side Francis I. promised to defend the States of the Church with all his might against Charles, and all insubordinate vassals. This last clause obviously referred to Ferrara, and Francis hesitated for a long time before agreeing to it. However, he at last consented, and the treaty was signed on the 22nd of October.†

Charles V., who knew nothing about this secret treaty, was all the time eagerly carrying on negotiations with the Pope, who understood how to keep him in hand by holding out hopes of a favourable agreement. But as soon as the co-operation of Francis had been apparently won by the treaty of October, Leo X. wished to make use of the advantages offered by the situation. Nevertheless, chiefly on account of Venice, he did not dare to take open

\* The above is from NITTI, 262 *seq.*

† NITTI, 254 *seq.*, 258 *seq.* This same investigator has published the text of the treaty of October in Arch. Rom., XVI., 229 *seqq.*

measures against Ferrara, and therefore had recourse to subterfuges. Without at first rousing any suspicion in Alfonso's mind,\* the Pope instigated a sudden attack on the Duke's capital by those whom he had banished from Ferrara. However, the watchfulness of the Marquis of Mantua frustrated the attempt.†

Fortune was more propitious to the Pope in the measures taken by him against the petty tyrants of the Marches of Ancona and Umbria, who had unlawfully usurped a power exceeding that which had belonged to their predecessors. The constant complaints of the people who were oppressed by these unscrupulous and riotous despots had for some time been calling for repressive measures. In March, 1520, Leo considered that the right moment had come for these to be taken; and ere long the tyrants of the Marches trembled before the energy which he displayed against them.‡ Giovanni de' Medici was commissioned to combine with the Bishop of Chiusi, Niccolò Bonafede, the Governor of the Marches, to reduce to subjection the Lord of Fermo, Lodovico Uffreducci, son of the criminal Oliverotto, who had been treacherously put to death by Cesare Borgia. Lodovico defended himself like a valiant condottiere, but lost both lands and life in an engagement at Monte Giorgio. Fermo then returned to the immediate dominion of the Pope, and the surrounding

\* This is related in a Despatch of Jan 14, 1520, from the Este Ambassador at Rome, in BALAN, VI., 25.

† GUICCIARDINI, XIII., 5; PISTOFILO in Atti Mod., III., 516; BAUMGARTEN, Karl V., I., 197; NITTI, 270. BALAN'S attempt (VI., 25) to prove that Leo X. was innocent of the attempt against Ferrara, seems useless in the face of available sources of information. Cf. SEMPER, Carpi, 14, who maintains that such breaches of peace were allowed by the policy of the age. See also LUZIO'S Review of Pastor's "Leo X." in the *Corriere della Sera*, 1906, No. 282.

‡ SANUTO, XXIX., 395.



places banished Uffreducci's representatives.\* Several of the petty tyrants of the Marches met with the same fate; two, the Lords of Recanati and Fabriano, were put to death; in Benevento the supremacy of Ettore Severiano was destroyed. The means used for ridding the Marches of these evil rulers must be condemned as equivocal and wholly unworthy of a Pope; nevertheless, "the country rejoiced at the result." Niccolò Bonafede did all he could to restore peace and order; and the government of the Papal officials proved to be "infinitely better than that of the lawless barons."†

It fared even worse with the despot of Perugia, Giampaolo Baglioni, than with Uffreducci. Leo X. had vainly tried to attach him to his person; ‡ but Giampaolo had met all his friendly advances with contempt. During the Urbino war his attitude was more than suspicious; and during the trial of Cardinal Petrucci a letter came to light which revealed his complicity in the conspiracy. The endless brawls in the house of Baglioni gave the Pope, in March, 1520, the desired opportunity of interfering, and destroying the power of this dangerous and disloyal vassal.§ Giampaolo was summoned to Rome to give an

\* Cf. ALFANI, *Mem. Perugine*, in the *Arch. Stor. Ital.*, XVI., 2, 286 *seq.*; JOVIUS, *Vita*, lib. 4; AMIANI, *Mem di Fano*, II., 123; FRACASSETTI, *Vita di N. Bonafede*, Pesaro, 1832, 117-166; BALAN, VI., 26; *Arch. d. Soc. Rom.*, XIII., 222. As to the measures taken against the leaders of the parties in Fabriano and Recanati, see the \*Report of Ang. Germanello, dat. Rome, March 24, 1520. Gonzaga Archives, Mantua.

† REUMONT, III., 2, 109; FRACASSETTI, *op. cit.*, 162 *seq.*, 167 *seq.*

‡ VERMIGLIOLI, *Vita di Malatesta IV. Baglioni*, 27; SUGENHEIM, 421.

§ Cf. GUICCIARDINI, XIII., 5; TIZIO, \**Hist. Senen.* in *Cod. G.* II., 38, f. 252 of the Chigi Library, Rome; FABRETTI, *Capitani venturieri dell' Umbria*, III., 221; BALAN, VI., 27, n. 1; CIPOLLA, 853 *seq.* Cf.

account of the banishment from Perugia of his cousin Gentile and the execution of his followers. Giampaolo, who was aware of his guilt, would not obey the summons, but sent his son Malatesta to Rome instead. He charged him to find out whether any serious action were really to be feared on the part of the Pope. But so skilful was Leo in hiding his real intentions, that Giampaolo was persuaded by his friends, especially by Camillo Orsini, to go to Rome. He openly trusted to the protection of that powerful noble, who had just before married his daughter. There is no proof that the Pope gave him a safe-conduct.\*

On the 16th of March Giampaolo entered Rome with a magnificent retinue, including several of the Orsini. Next day he waited on the Pope, who was in the Castle of St. Angelo; where, as soon as he entered the gate, the Castellan had him arrested. The Governor of Rome tried him, and both Cardinals Bibbiena and Armellini urged that he should suffer the extreme punishment of

FABRONIUS, 309; BONAZZI, II., 74. As to the extraordinary Congregation held on March 9, 1520, on account of Giampaolo Baglioni, see Ang. Germanello's reports in a \*Letter dat. from Rome, March 10, 1520. Gonzaga Archives, Mantua.

\* The assertion that a "safe-conduct, written by Leo X. himself," was given, made by SISMONDI (XIV., 503), SUGENHEIM (422), DE LEVA (I. 92), GREGOROVIVS (VIII., 247), and BONAZZI (II., 78), is pronounced of doubtful worth by REUMONT (III., 2, 108). BALAN (VI., 27, n. 5) brings forward against it a number of valid reasons, the most important of which is that ALFANI directly implies that it was not given by his remark (288): "Si dice N. S. aver detto che Giovan Paolo andasse non avendo errato." The Ferrara Ambassador merely says: "Baglione ed altri furono conducti dove sono da bone parole." This witness especially would have been sure to have mentioned a safe-conduct, had such existed. Ang. Germanello, in his \*Report of March 17 (Appendix, No. 16), says nothing about a letter of safe-conduct. Gonzaga Archives, Mantua.

the law.\* When the news of what had occurred reached Perugia, his friends there considered him as already "more dead than alive." In Rome his execution was generally expected; though there were some who thought that if he renounced all claim to the government of Perugia, he might be set at liberty.† However, the position of the prisoner was aggravated, and the conditions of his captivity made more severe, on account of the discovery of a plot of his to stir up a revolution in the Marches of Ancona. Thereupon his sons fled to the Abruzzi and thence to Venice.‡ Horrible revelations came to light in the course of the trial, in addition to the offences already brought against him. Sources above suspicion§ relate that Giampaolo was found guilty of coining, murder, and bloodshed. In any case the accused deserved the punishment of death, which was carried out in the night between the 2nd and 3rd of June.|| Giampaolo, who consoled himself in prison

\* Cf. the \*Report of Ang. Germanello, April 3, 1521. Gonzaga Archives, Mantua.

† See Letter of Paolucci of March 17, 1520, in BALAN, VI., 28, n. 1. Cf. the \*Diary in Cod. Barb., lat. 3552 (Vatican Library), and the letter quoted (note *supra*) of Ang. Germanello of April 3, 1521.

‡ Letter of Paolucci, of March 20, in BALAN, VI., 28, n. 3. Cf. SANUTO, XXIX., 403. In Venice Giampaolo's sons at once allied themselves to Francesco Maria della Rovere, the consequences of which were seen immediately after the death of Leo X. (see ALFANI, 290, 292-293); this also proves that the accusation against their father of an earlier understanding with Francesco Maria was only too well founded.

§ See especially the Letter of Paolucci of April 3, 1520, who was certainly not biassed in favour of Leo X., BALAN, VI., 28, n. 4, and the Venetian report in SANUTO, XXIX., 406.

|| Jo. Paulo Baglione in questa notte a sette hore circa li fù tagliata la testa (Paolucci, June 3, 1520, in BALAN, VI., 29, n. 1). So also Tizio in FABRONIUS, 309, and Ang. Germanello in his \*Reports of June 2 and 4, 1521 (Gonzaga Archives, Mantua). According to him Baglioni



by reading Ariosto's "Orlando Furioso,"\* died a penitent sinner. Gentile Baglioni, who had been banished by him, received his possessions. Perugia retained only a nominal liberty, the Legate, Silvio Passerini, Cardinal of Cortona, being the actual governor.†

During these events, negotiations for the forming of a triple alliance between the Pope, France, and Venice fell through because of the refusal of the Signoria to accept the clause agreed to by Francis I. in October, relating to the co-operation against the Pope's insubordinate vassals, or, in other words, against Ferrara.‡

It was most important that just at this crisis Charles V. should have sent a new Ambassador to Rome in the person of the Castilian, Juan Manuel, who had "grown

was "al primo revellino," beheaded in the Castle ; \**el corpo fo portato a S. Maria Traspontina, benchè prima fosse deliberato ponerlo in publico, ma el papa ad le preci del S. Renzo da Ceri revocò dicta deliberatione* (*cf.* SANUTO, XXIX., 603). In a second \*Report of June 4, 1521, Germanello specifies the hour of execution: *Allidoi del presente ad hore doi e meza de nocte.* *Cf.* the \*Diary in Cod. Barb. lat. 3552 (beheading of Baglioni on June 2), Vatican Library, and the \*Letter of Stefano Saffa (detto l'Eremita), dated from Rome, June 6, 1520, who states explicitly that Baglioni went to confession before he was put to death (State Archives, Modena). ALFANI (*loc. cit.*), following FABRETTI and GREGOROVIVS (VII., 247), erroneously places the execution on June 11. A \*Letter of Fabrizio Pellegrino, dated from Rome, June 7, 1520, speaks as follows about this thrilling event: *Da molti è giudicato chel papa non habia voluto andar in processione per paura de non esser morto ; el se vede per le guardie grande.* (Gonzaga Archives, Mantua.) Even in October and December the Pope feared traps on the part of the Baglioni's relative, Camillo Orsini (SANUTO, XXIX., 342, 423).

\* Paolucci, in a \*letter of May 26, 1520, quoted Vol. VII. of this work, 398 *seq.*, reports thus: *Joan Paulo Baione vive si come intendo et si fa legiere Orlando furioso.* State Archives, Modena.

† VERMIGLIOLI, *loc. cit.*, 31 *seq.* ; BONAZZI, II., 81 *seqq.*

‡ NITTI, 266 *seqq.*



grey in diplomacy," and proved to be as astute as he was energetic.\* Being provided with full instructions, far-reaching powers, and plenty of money, Juan Manuel entered Rome with great pomp on the 11th of April, 1520.† The Pope received him very amicably, and Cardinal Medici invited him to dwell in his palace at the Cancelleria. Manuel presented the draft of a treaty, with the proviso that not one word of it was to be altered.‡ But more than a year went by before any agreement was effected. In the general obscurity of the situation it cannot cause surprise that the Pope should for some time have vacillated between Charles and Francis.§ If at last he decided in favour of the Emperor, and against Francis, it was less on account of the prospect held out by an alliance with the former of an increase of the States of the Church, than because of two other momentous reasons, namely, the extreme imprudence of the French King, and the consideration of the blow given to the authority of the Pope by the Lutheran movement in Germany.

The first disturbance in the relations between Rome and France came at the beginning of 1520, in consequence of the illegal pretensions of Francis I. to the guardianship of

\* BAUMGARTEN, Karl V., I., 197. Cf. 281 *seq.*, and HÖFLER, in the *Histor. Jahrb.*, VI., 551 *seq.* The former Spanish Ambassador, Pedro Urrea, had died in 1518; as to his haughty bearing, cf. Paris de Grassis in HOFFMANN, 401 *seq.*

† SANUTO, XXVIII., 423. Cf., together with the witnesses quoted by GREGOROVIVS (VIII., 250) and BAUMGARTEN (I, 282), the \*Report of Ang. Germanello of April 11, 1520 (Gonzaga Archives, Mantua), in Appendix, No. 17, and the \*Letter of the Este Ambassador, Paolucci, Rome, 1520, April 11. State Archives, Modena.

‡ "Sin mudar palabra." Manuel to Charles V., dated Rome, 1520, May 12. NITTI, 303, n. 1.

§ Reichstagsakten, II., 60.

Catherine de' Medici.\* Cardinal Bibbiena, who had just returned from France,† seems to have smoothed over this misunderstanding ; but Leo X. soon had fresh reasons for complaint against his confederate. While carrying on his negotiations for forming a league between Rome, France, and Venice, he learned to his bitter experience that Francis had no intention of keeping his word and renouncing his patronage of the Duke of Ferrara.‡ Moreover, the spirit in which the French King meant to keep his solemn pledges in regard to the Turkish war, was revealed when the Pope asked his help on behalf of Rhodes, upon which the Sultan Selim was meditating an attack. Francis flatly refused all assistance.§

Moreover, constant complaints came from Milan of the French encroachments on the rights of the Church.|| Almost as if these offences gave him the right to ask for more favours, Francis I. was for ever seeking for fresh concessions ; and if these were not at once granted, he used the most violent threats. In the autumn of 1520 he showed so little consideration towards the Pope that his imprudence can cause nothing but surprise. First, he demanded the prolongation by five years of the office of Legate in France for Cardinal Gouffier de Boissy. Not content with obtaining this extraordinary concession, he took the opportunity of trying to enforce the discontinuance of his protection of the rights of the Legate of Avignon. In

\* See the Letter of Giulio de' Medici to the French Nuncio G. Staffileo, Jan. 7, 1520, in NITTI, 326, n. 1.

† Cf. BANDINI, Bibbiena, 37 *seqq.* ; LUZIO-RENIER, Mantova, 241. About his reception in Consistory, Jan. 9, 1520, see Paris de Grassis in HOFFMANN, 441 ; Acta Consist. in KALKOFF, Forschungen, 71 *seq.* Cf. \*Diary in Cod. Barb., lat. 3552, Vatican Library.

‡ NITTI, 272.

§ See Despatch of Paolucci, June 3, 1520, in BALAN, VI., 30.

|| GUICCIARDINI, XIV., 1. Cf. RAYNALDUS, 1521, n. 78.

vain did the Pope make friendly remonstrances through his Nuncios, Staffileo and Rucellai.\* In vain did he comply with the King's demands so far as to remove the written clause in the stipulation, and allow the word of Francis to suffice. Suggestions were bandied about on both sides from September to December without any agreement being arrived at.† But even while this dispute was going on, Francis I. picked another quarrel with the Holy See. He suddenly forbade the proclamation in France of the Bull of Maundy Thursday, with the command that whoever attempted to carry it out "should be drowned." "The Pope," wrote Cardinal Medici to the French Nuncio, "thinks it better to make no reply to this threat, lest he be carried away by anger. Therefore, should the King repeat the intimation in your presence, you must reply pleasantly that such a threat is not likely to make the Sacred College anxious to comply with other requests of his, whether it be about a Cardinal's hat or anything else."‡ This last remark led to another quarrel, which burst out at the beginning of the year.

At this time Charles V. asked for the red hat for the Bishop of Liège, Eberhard de la Mark; while almost simultaneously Francis requested the same for his relative, Jean d'Orléans, Archbishop of Toulouse. Hearing of the petition of the Emperor, the French King declared that on no account would he consent to the elevation to the purple of the Bishop of Liège, who was his mortal enemy. Con-

\* Cf. PIEPER, *Nuntiaturen*, 58 *seq.*

† Manosc. Torrig., XXV., 387 *seq.*; SANUTO, XXIX., 288, 447-448. On July 22, 1519, the dignity of Papal Legate in France was prolonged for one year. See \*Brief of Leo X. to Francis I., dated July 22, 1519. Archives of St. Angelo, Arm. IV., caps. I., n. 16, Secret Archives of the Vatican.

‡ Manosc. Torrig., XXV., 390.

sequently, Leo X. tried to persuade Charles to renounce the candidature which was so hateful to France, and accept instead the nomination of Eberhard to the Archbishopric of Valencia. As this compromise was not accepted, the Pope offered two other cardinals' hats, but neither to this alternative would the Emperor consent. Thereupon the Pope tried to conciliate Francis by the promise of the appointment of two French Cardinals if he would give up his opposition to the elevation of Eberhard de la Mark. But this proposal was declined. Francis maintained his pretensions that the Pope must make no appointment against his wishes, even at the risk of a quarrel being caused between Charles and the Holy See. The French King carried his arrogance still further by requiring of the Pope a declaration of his intentions toward the Duke of Ferrara, and demanding the restoration of Modena and Reggio to that prince. In vain did the King's best friend, the prudent Cardinal Bibbiena, warn him against going too far; Francis remained firm in his contention that on no account should Eberhard be made a Cardinal.\*

In the autumn, Leo X. believed that he had at last found a way of pacifying the exacting French King.† A Consistory was held on the 17th of September, at which the requests for Cardinals' hats made by the Emperor, France, and England were considered. The Pope proposed that Jean d'Orléans, Archbishop of Toulouse, should be raised to the purple; and this was the only elevation decided on. The publication of this decision was left in the

\* Cf. Letter of Bibbiena, May 19, 1520, in MOLINI, I., 84-85; SANUTO, XXVIII., 137, 395, 435; XXIX., 123, 144, 164; BERGENROTH, II., n. 282, 283, 284; BAUMGARTEN, Karl V., I., 289-290. About Eberhard de la Mark, cf. DEMARTEAU in the Confer. de la Soc. de Liège, III., 75 *seq.*

† About the threats of the French, see NITTI, 324.



hands of His Holiness. As regarded the promotion of the Bishop of Liège, Leo X. declared emphatically that he would grant it only subject to the consent of Francis I.\*

Charles V. alone could have found cause for complaint in this last concession to France. Judge then the astonishment of the Pope when, not Charles, but Francis, made a grievance of it! The French King and his adherents in Rome believed that, owing to the revolt of the towns in Spain, the whole of the world, including the Pope, was in their hands.† Acting in this spirit, Francis I. declared that the fact of the Pope having spoken at all—especially in Consistory—about the elevation of the Bishop of Liège, was an attack on his own person. Leo X. had remained unmoved in the face of the continuous and complete want of consideration on the part of France; but his anger was all the more violent now. Instead of gratitude for his

\* As to the Consistory of September 17, see Letters of the French Nuncio of Sept. 26 and Oct. 10, 1520, in *Manoscr. Torrig.*, XXV., 393, 396 *seq.*; *cf.* 394–395. BAUMGARTEN, Karl V., I. 291, has overlooked this; hence his mistaken statement as to the day and resolution of the Consistory. The inexplicable statement in Baumgarten that Manuel reported, as early as the 12th of September, concerning a Consistory held about the promotions of Cardinals, is explained by the fact that the Consistory of the 17th was preceded by one which discussed the same subject, see *Manoscr. Torrig.*, XXV., 394. That a Consistory was held on the 17th of Sept. is confirmed by the *\*Acta Consist.* (Consistorial Archives of the Vatican), which unfortunately, for the sake of brevity, does not report on this matter. There must be a mistake in the translation of the letter of Campeggio in BREWER, III., I, n. 993. See also the unsatisfactory statement in SANUTO, XXIX., 195.

† “Galli miro gaudio exultant atque iubilant et adeo insolenter ut sibi totius terrarum orbis imperium in manibus habere videantur.” Report of Gigli to Wolsey from Rome, Sept. 26, 1520; BREWER, III., I, n. 994. *Cf.* BERGENROTH, II., n. 293.

concessions, he received nothing but the most outrageous complaints and injurious threats. Never, during his whole Pontificate, had His Holiness been so incensed, wrote Cardinal Medici to the French Nuncio, Rucellai. The Pope repudiated the idea of such servitude as forbade to him freedom of speech even with the College of Cardinals.\* Obviously the elevation to the purple of the Archbishop of Toulouse was now postponed.† Nevertheless no formal breach with France ensued ; on the contrary, it seemed to the uninitiated that, in spite of all differences, the relations between France and Leo X. were closer than ever. But in his inmost heart the Pope had turned his back for good and all on Francis I.

Unmistakable facts had convinced Leo X. that the French "were as unbearable as allies as they were formidable as enemies." This bitter though dearly-bought experience ripened in the Pope's mind the resolution he had formed to regain the temporal and spiritual independence of the Holy See by driving the French out of Italy. There were many other reasons in favour of an alliance with the Emperor, the chief of which was that his help was indispensable against the anti-Papal Lutheran revolt in Germany.‡ Probably the skilful and prudent Cardinal Bibbiena might have still found means to reconcile the Pope to Francis I., but at this crucial moment that most zealous champion of French interests at the Roman Court was laid low by an illness which was ere long to carry him to his grave. He died on the 9th of November, 1520.

So as to be ready for any event, the Pope decided, in

\* Medici to Rucellai, Oct. 1, 1520. Manosc. Torrig., XXV., 396-397.

† SANUTO, XXIX., 307, 514 ; NITTI, 325, n. 3.

‡ NITTI, 326, 330 *seq.* ; ULMANN, Studien, II., 111-112. Cf. LANZ, Einleitung, 242, 252.

October, to take into his service six thousand Swiss mercenaries.\* On the 2nd of that month he told the Imperial Ambassador Manuel that he had sent to his Nuncio and Raffaello de' Medici the draft of a new alliance with the Emperor. The scheme was that of an offensive alliance against France, such, indeed, as was with few alterations carried out eight months later. As a proof of his sincerity, Leo X. offered that a man trusted by the German Ambassador should be hidden under a bed during the negotiations which Saint-Marceau, the new Envoy of Francis I., was to carry on with the Pope.†

Saint-Marceau, who relieved the less capable Morette, arrived in Rome on the 17th of October, 1520. His proposals were startling. Francis I., they ran, wished to conquer Naples, not for himself, but for a third party. As a bait to the Pope he offered to him a portion of the kingdom of Naples and Ferrara.‡ The negotiations, based on this, dragged on till the end of January, 1521. At last a secret agreement was made that the Pope should accept Ferrara and a strip of the Neapolitan coast extending as far as the Garigliano, while the kingdom of Naples proper should go to the second son of Francis I.§ In return Francis was given facilities for passing through the lines

\* Eidgenöss. Abschiede, III., 2, 1264; Reichstagsakten, II., 61.

† Report of Manuel, Oct. 2; see BERGENROTH, II., n. 299, and NITTI, 335 *seq.*

‡ See BERNAYS in the Reichstagsakten, II., 60, n. 1, containing the authentic proof.

§ BERGENROTH (II., n. 267) gives an epitome of this compact from a copy in Rome made by order of Philip II., but places it in the year 1519. That the compact belongs to 1521, and was really concluded then, has been fully proved by BERNAYS in the Reichstagsakten, II., 61, n. 5. Thus the opinion of BAUMGARTEN (Karl V., I., 367) and NITTI (361-362), that Saint-Marceau's mission was without any results, falls to the ground.

of the six thousand Swiss mercenaries, the half of whose pay he undertook to provide.\*

Francis I. had no idea of carrying out what he thus pledged himself to do. For a long time he had been lending a willing ear to those who advised him to weaken, as far as possible, the Papal power in Italy. He did not intend that either the portion of the Neapolitan coast or the Duchy of Ferrara should fall to the Pope's share; on the contrary, the French Court planned the complete dismemberment of the States of the Church. After Leo X. had helped with the conquest of Naples, the strip of sea-coast mentioned in the agreement was to be given to Venice. At the same time the Medici ascendancy in Florence was to be overthrown, and the separation of Bologna, Perugia, and the Romagna from the States of the Church effected by placing them under the rule of different small dynasties.† The details of these projects were only very partially known to Leo X., but he suspected double-dealing on the part of the French King, and fought him with his own weapons.

Nearly at the same time as the Pope was carrying on these secret transactions with Saint-Marceau, he was negotiating with the Emperor's representative; in fact a repetition was going on of the double-dealing policy of January, 1519.‡ On the 11th of December, 1520, Leo X. exchanged with Manuel a written assurance that for three months neither party had concluded any agreement contrary to the interests of the other, and that he would not do so during the next three months. This pledge

\* Eidgenöss. Abschiede, IV., 1, 10 *seq.*, 14; SANUTO, XXX., 26; Reichstagsakten, II., 62-63, n. 1.

† Cf. the interesting treatise of G. SALLES, *Un traître au XVI<sup>me</sup> siècle*, Clément Champion, valet de chambre de François I<sup>er</sup>, in the *Revue d. quest. hist.*, 1900, II., 56 *seq.*

‡ See Vol. VII. of this work, p. 271.



was renewed some time between the middle of March, 1521, and the end of April, notwithstanding the secret treaty between the Pope and France made in January.\* With the utmost skill the diplomatic Medici had once more succeeded in coming to an agreement with both rivals at once. As soon as the six thousand Swiss had arrived in the Papal States, which should be at the beginning of April, the Pope could make his irrevocable decision with more security.† That this final decision was adverse to France was mostly the French King's own fault, for instead of binding the Pope to him territorially, he had in his blindness driven him into the arms of his antagonist.‡

The agreement with France was to be carried out only after the adhesion to it of Venice; and while this was being negotiated, the Pope became more and more doubtful whether the promise of the French King to help him to conquer Ferrara had any sincerity in it.§ This state of uncertainty estranged him from Francis, and drove him further towards the Emperor. Each day the necessity of the help of the latter for the suppression of the Lutheran revolt became more apparent to him.||

As soon as he arrived in Rome, Manuel recognized the importance of the anti-Papal movement in Germany as a factor in the Pope's attitude towards Charles. As early as the 12th of May, 1520, he gave his Imperial master the advice to refrain, during his visit to Germany, from any

\* BERGENROTH, II., n. 312; BAUMGARTEN, Karl V., I., 420, 431.

† Eidgenöss. Abschiede, IV., 1, 31; Reichstagsakten, II., 63.

‡ REUMONT, III., 2, 118.

§ See BERNAYS in Reichstagsakten, II., 62, n.

|| JOVIUS (Vita, lib. 4) has already pointed this out. ULMANN (Studien, II., 112) is also of opinion that "for the present, however little may be known, we must hold that the consideration of the interests of the faith of the Church conduced not a little to make common cause between the Pope and the Emperor."

marks of favour towards a certain monk known as Brother Martin, or the Elector Frederick of Saxony. Leo had, he said, quite an extraordinary fear of Brother Martin, for he preached against the Pope, and was considered to be very learned. Manuel thought that this might be turned to account in compelling Leo to conclude a treaty; though he was of opinion that such pressure should be applied only in the event of the Pope's hesitating to sign or else breaking the treaty.\*

It is not known what Charles replied to this piece of advice. In Manuel's reports up to the end of December there is a great deal said about a political alliance between Pope and Emperor, but no mention of the Lutheran affair; though it is fair to say that we do not possess all the reports. It cannot therefore be said with certainty whether Manuel did use the weapon which this religious revolt afforded against the Pope. It is not at all improbable that an unprincipled politician like the German representative should, even without the explicit consent of his master, utilize, in the course of the protracted negotiations, a circumstance which proved the Pope's absolute dependence on the assistance of the Emperor in this important matter. He would, however, have been certain to use the weapon with diplomatic prudence, employing hints, covert, though not difficult to interpret.

After the adverse judgment had fallen on Luther in June, the Pope himself could not fail to see how much depended in this affair on the attitude of the Emperor. However, although the news from Germany became more and more alarming, Leo X. was such an experienced diplomatist that he carefully avoided anything which could betray his great need of help.†

\* BERGENROTH, II., n. 279.

† Even PALLAVICINO (I., c. 25) expresses the opinion that the Pope

That at that time he desired the favour of the Emperor, is shown by his tenacity about the idea of raising the Bishop of Liège to the purple, in spite of the obstinate resistance and threats of Francis.\* The same spirit was shown by the granting of certain concessions demanded by Charles about Briefs which hampered the action of the Inquisition in Aragon. That Leo complied unwillingly is shown by the gradual manner of his consent. On the 12th of December, 1520, he declared his willingness to partially withdraw the Briefs in question; but only on the 16th of January, 1521, did he consent to do so entirely.† On the 13th of December, 1520, Manuel was nevertheless able to send the Emperor the much-desired Brief against Antonio de Acuña, Bishop of Zamora, who was implicated in the Spanish revolt.‡

Meanwhile the Emperor had loyally carried out the anti-Lutheran Bull in the Netherlands.§ At his coronation at

showed great reserve in appealing for secular assistance against Luther, lest he should betray his helplessness and individual weakness, thereby letting it be seen how much he depended on the Emperor for assistance, and thus give him the opportunity of reaping some advantage for himself in Italian affairs. This opinion is manifest in Aleander's report of Feb. 8, 1521, in which he says: "I know that in Rome they are most anxious to conceal the importance of the affair, lest occasion be given to the Imperialists to set their foot on our neck." BALAN, n. 36; BRIEGER, n. 6; KALKOFF, Aleander, 73. BALAN (VI., 38) believes that Leo's utterance—"Non sono a resolvermi a chosa alcuna finche non veda che esito haverà questa dieta imperiale"—refers to the Lutheran affair. Only the words given before (31, n. 1)—"et quando se resolvesse il cattolico Re volere venire a prehender la corona, etc."—show that he had in his mind the Emperor's journey to Rome.

\* Cf. *supra*, p. 11 seq.

† LLORENTE, I., 481. Cf. BERGENROTH, II., n. 317.

‡ BAUMGARTEN, Karl V., I., 462. Cf. HÖFLER, Antonio de Acuña, Vienna, 1882.

§ See Vol. VII. of this work, p. 420.

Aix on the 23rd of October, he swore to hold fast by the Holy Catholic Faith as delivered to the Apostles, and to show due submission and fidelity to the Pope and Holy Roman See. A few days later the Archbishop of Mayence read aloud a Papal Brief to the effect that the Pope had given to the King, as formerly to Maximilian I., the title of "Emperor-elect of the Romans."\*

On the 14th of November Leo X. answered the letter of Charles, written on the day of his coronation, by which he notified that event: "As there are two planets in heaven," the Pope said, "the sun and the moon, which surpass in brilliancy all the stars, so are there two great dignitaries on earth, the Pope and the Emperor, to whom all other princes are subject and owe obedience." The letter ended by an exhortation to Charles to remain a loyal son of the Church.† There seemed no doubt that Charles would fulfil his whole duty as protector of the Church, as far as the Lutheran movement was concerned. "The Emperor," Aleander reports from Cologne at the beginning of November, "does not let himself be led away by Hutten's anti-Roman agitation; he stands firm on our side." Aleander had nothing but good to report about the Catholic zeal of the Archbishops of Mayence, Treves, and Cologne. With his usual optimism, he believed that he would even be able to come round the Elector of Saxony.‡

\* Cf. JANSSEN-PASTOR, II.<sup>18</sup>, 148, 150.

† BERGENROTH, II., n. 380. The Papal Brief paraphrases the thoughts concerning the co-operation of the two supreme powers of Christendom which are expressed in the credentials of Manuel (LANZ, Mon. Habsburg, II., 177 *seq.*). The original letter of Charles V. to Leo X. about his coronation is in the Vatican Archives, Arm., II., caps. 1, n. 59 (quoted in Reichstagsakten, II., 102).

‡ See the Letter of Aleander, Nov. 6, 1520, in Reichstagsakten, II., 461; see Vol. VII. of this work, p. 421.



This and the other news from Germany\* had such a soothing effect in Rome that a deceptive security prevailed. On the 3rd of December, 1520, Cardinal Medici wrote to Aleander a letter full of joyful praise, congratulating him on the activity he had shown, and thanking him, in the name of the Pope, for the welcome news he sent of the good dispositions of the Germans, and their devotion to the Holy See, as shown by their attitude towards the new Arius or Mahomet, "whom might God bring to a right mind."†

But to these glowing reports of Aleander's there succeeded others which caused much anxiety. It was with amazement that Rome learned the proportions which the anti-Roman movement had assumed in Germany. Very great alarm was caused by the intelligence that the good intentions of the young Emperor were hampered by political considerations, and the temporizing spirit of his immediate surroundings. Consternation was caused by Aleander's news that his efforts to obtain an imperial mandate against Lutheran books had been met by a decided refusal from the imperialists, who maintained that Luther must be heard and must be allowed to appeal to the Diet.‡ The Pope ignored this, and at the end of December proposed to Manuel that Luther should receive a safe-conduct to Rome, where a body

\* On Nov. 24, 1520, Achille Borromeo sent to the Marquis of Mantua a report from Cologne, dated Nov. 10, 1520, in which it was said: \*Martin Luter è stato danato per ereticho de qui et questo perche la M<sup>te</sup> Ces. insieme con li electori li a posto le mane salvo che Sassonia, el quale credo che anchora lui se aria remesso, se non fusse stato tre o quatro de quelli soi favoriti di quali spero chel ducha col tempo li dara la punitione che merita per esser nemichi de la fede cristiana. Gonzaga Archives, Mantua.

† BALAN, Mon. ref., n. 5.

‡ Letter of Aleander, Dec. 14, 1520; BALAN, n. 11; BRIEGER, n. 1.

of men should be selected to speak and dispute with him.\*

Meanwhile the term set for Luther's recantation had expired, and the Pope issued a new Bull against him on the 3rd of January, 1521. By it the excommunication threatened in June was now pronounced, because of the obstinate persistence in error of himself and his followers; and the places in which he resided were placed under an interdict.† In the middle of January there arrived news of the successful results which Aleander had obtained from the Emperor on the 29th of December.‡ The news also came that, by burning the Bull *Exsurge* and the books of canon law, Luther had given the signal of war to the death.§ On the 18th of January, 1521, the Pope sent to the Emperor a formal and urgent request to have the Bull of excommunication against Luther published, and a general edict issued for its execution throughout Germany. Let the Emperor, so ran this Brief, the work of Sadoletto, remember the example of earlier Emperors, who always fought against heresy. Let him also remember how God had blessed him, young as he was, and had confided to him the sword of the greatest power in the world. He wore it in vain if he did not employ it against infidels and heretics.|| Similar letters were sent to Charles's confessor, Glapion, and several princes of the Empire. In sending these letters on the 28th of January, Cardinal Medici declared that the Pope and the Sacred College were full of praise of the holy

\* Letter of Manuel, Dec. 31, 1520, in BERGENROTH, II., n. 314.

† Cf. Vol. VII. of this work, p. 415.

‡ Cf. Vol. VII. of this work, p. 426.

§ Cf. in Appendix, No. 18, the \*Report of F. Pellegrino, dated from Rome, Jan. 15, 1521. Gonzaga Archives, Mantua.

|| SADOLETI Epist., 95 *seqq.*; FÖRSTEMANN, Neues Urkundenbuch, 27-29; BALAN, n. 13; Reichstagsakten, II., 495, n. 1.

zeal shown by the Emperor in this affair, which was so near to all their hearts alike. On the same occasion Aleander was sent a bill of exchange which was nearly as welcome to him as were the letters sent by the same messenger.\* In special letters to Aleander of the 1st and 6th of February, 1521, Aleander was instructed by Cardinal Medici to forcibly point out to the Emperor that the Lutheran movement was as much his affair as that of the Pope and Holy See, because the religious innovators were as much set on the overthrow of the authority of the Empire as on that of the Church. Therefore, the dearest personal interests of Charles and the princes of the Empire demanded the suppression of the new doctrines.†

On the 6th of February a Consistory was held at St. Angelo, at which the Pope gave directions for dealing with two conflagrations which had broken out. The first he described as the menace to the States of the Church from plundering bands of soldiers, against whom he would, in case of necessity, employ the six thousand Swiss whose services he had hired.‡ The other conflagration was the movement to which Luther and his followers had given rise. The Pope told the Cardinals that they would do well to draw up a memorial to send to the Emperor about this. Some of the Cardinals were of opinion that Schönberg had better deliver this document, and that when this had been

\* BALAN, Mon. ref., n. 16. At the same time the Pope granted the Emperor's request relating to the Inquisition in Aragon; see *supra*, p. 19; cf. BERGENROTH, II., n. 317, 318. On Jan. 30, 1521, the Venetian Ambassador reported that the Pope had on that day received, at Magliana, a letter from Germany by courier, "e lecte il Papa stè sopra di se, le qual letere erano di Alemagna," SANUTO, XXIX., 615. Unfortunately it cannot be established which letter it was which is here alluded to, for Aleander's despatches of January, 1521, are lost.

† BALAN, n. 17, 18.

‡ Cf. *supra*, p. 16.

done, two or three Cardinal-Legates might be sent to Germany.\*

On the 13th of February Leo X. pointed out most forcibly to Manuel the evil consequences, not only to the Papacy, but also to the power of the Empire, if Luther's errors were not uprooted. Afterwards the Pope proposed in Consistory the mission of several Cardinal-Legates to the Diet, though the plan was abandoned in consequence of Aleander's representations to the contrary.†

At that time the Lutheran affair occupied the mind of the Pope almost to the exclusion of anything else. The Venetian Ambassador‡ testifies that Leo spent many hours in reading a work against Luther, probably that written by the Dominican, Ambrogio Catarino.§ The question of an alliance with the Emperor, which had hitherto turned chiefly on politics, now received a new importance from the point of view of what the Emperor could do against Luther and his followers.|| On the 25th of February Manuel wrote to tell his master how very much Leo had the Lutheran affair at heart, so that his chief object in desiring an interview with the Emperor was to concert with him as to what measures could be taken to protect the Church against the attacks of Luther.¶ On the same day that Manuel made this report, the Pope sent to the Emperor an adulatory letter. From what he could learn from the Nuncios, he said, he could see with joy that His Majesty

\* Acta Consist. in KALKOFF, *Forschungen*, 81.

† BERGENROTH, II., n. 320 ; BALAN, n. 41 ; BRIEGER, n. 13.

‡ SANUTO, XXIX., 650 *seq.*

§ *Apologia pro veritate cath. et apost. fidei*, appeared in December, 1520 ; see ENDERS, III., 105, 119 ; KALKOFF, Aleander, 87, n. 1, About A. Catarino, see *infra*, p. 252.

|| NITTI, 368-369.

¶ BERGENROTH, II., n. 322.



was rivalling Constantine, Charlemagne, and Otto in his zeal for the honour of the Church, and he praised God for thus inspiring him. In an autograph postscript, Leo X. reminded the Emperor that, if necessary, he could take up sword and buckler in defence of the Church.\* Laudatory letters in the same strain were sent to various spiritual and secular princes of Germany;† and at the same time the two Nuncios were formally re-accredited to the German Court.‡ When he sent these documents on the 3rd of March, Cardinal Medici repeated his injunction to Aleander to do everything to convince the Emperor that the innovators did not aim only at overthrowing the Church, but that, after the manner of the Hussites, they wished to destroy the imperial power as well. He praised Aleander's discourse before the Diet as a brilliant and most useful performance.§

The news that, in spite of all the Nuncios' remonstrances, Luther was to be called before the Diet, caused great excitement in Rome. The Pope laid down his exact position in the matter of the sequestration of Lutheran books, in a special instruction which he sent to the Nuncios in the second half of March. In this he took his stand on the fact that Luther, having been lawfully sentenced, could not be admitted to a public examination. Nevertheless the Emperor might lawfully grant him a private interview

\* BALAN, n. 26. Manuel forwarded the Brief on the 1st of March ; see BERGENROTH, II., n. 324.

† BALAN, n. 27, already published in SADOLETI Epist., 101 *seq.*

‡ This was due to an expostulation of Aleander's on the 12th of Feb. (BALAN, n. 21 ; BRIEGER, n. 7). Medici replied on Feb. 26 that the omission had not arisen from want of consideration for Aleander, but because he had not asked for it. Neither had Caracciolo been mentioned ; but he always left Aleander to speak as the chief agent in the Lutheran affair (BALAN, n. 28 ; KALKOFF, Aleander, 82, n. 2).

§ BALAN, n. 33.

without witnesses, and might, if he acknowledged his errors, promise him the Pope's pardon, or else give him a safe-conduct to Rome, or to the Spanish Inquisition. Should Luther accept none of these, there was nothing left to be done except to send him back with his safe-conduct, and then proceed with energy against him and his followers. As regarded the previous sequestration of Lutheran books, it was agreed that nothing could be done except to burn them publicly, should Luther refuse to recant. The Emperor was worthy of praise for having so far been emphatic in his protection of the Church in this affair; but he should be warned not to retreat now, in the middle of his course.\*

The plan of summoning Luther before the Diet pained and disturbed the Pope very much; for hitherto the young Emperor had been the only person on whom he believed himself able to rely. However, even at this juncture, Leo X. did not forget the exigencies of diplomatic prudence. He allowed Manuel to perceive his fear lest the Emperor should give in too much, without betraying his need of help and the greatness of his anxiety.† Cardinal Medici was more forcible and explicit in what he wrote to Aleander. The goodwill of the Emperor is not in itself enough, he wrote in a letter of the 19th of March; his offers must also be carried out. The Pope is not quite pleased with the endless delays in carrying out the measures commanded by the Emperor himself. The zeal of His

\* The *Notula mittenda ad nuntios* in BALAN, n. 34, *s.d.* BRIEGER (*Theol. Lit. Ztg.*, 1884, 480) had already remarked that this belonged at latest to February or the beginning of March. WREDE (*Reichstagsakten*, II., 825, n. 1) places it more correctly in the second half of March. KALKOFF (*Aleander*, 120 n.) agrees with this opinion; he surmises that its author was the Grand Penitentiary.

† Cf. BAUMGARTEN, *Karl V.*, I., 435-436

Majesty has without doubt cooled; he who has been called to be the defender of the Church, lends his ear to her enemies. If the Emperor does not decide the matter before the conclusion of the Diet, the most vexatious consequences may be apprehended. Nevertheless God will not forsake His Church. But, the letter went on to say, Aleander must do nothing except in combination with the Nuncio Caracciolo and with Raffaello de' Medici.\*

Immediately afterwards, on the 20th of March, the Pope brought forward the matter in Consistory. Several Cardinals expressly complained at the Emperor's having cited Luther to appear before the Diet, and thereby assumed a jurisdiction which belonged to the Holy See. When Leo X. communicated this opinion to the Imperial Ambassador, he remarked that, in summoning Luther to appear, the Emperor had been badly advised. It was impossible that Luther should be received even in hell, and Manuel would do well to warn his Imperial master in every letter he wrote not to take the matter lightly.† Under these circumstances it was doubly important that Leo X. should condemn Luther in so many words as an excommunicate and heretic. This was done in the Bull *In Coena Domini*, issued on Maundy Thursday (March 28).‡

There was a difference of opinion as to whether a letter of safe-conduct couched in honourable terms should be given

\* BALAN, n. 49; KALKOFF, Aleander, 112, n. 1. On the 16th of March laudatory letters were sent to the Electors of Mayence and Brandenburg, and a letter of admonition to Duke George of Saxony. SADOLETI Epist., 103 *seqq.*; BALAN, n. 51, 52; Reichstagsakten, II., 662, 809, n. 1.

† BERGENROTH, II., n. 325. What passed in Consistory is touched on quite lightly even in SANUTO, XXX., 60; but here, as in the \*Acta Consist., nothing is mentioned except the arrangements made for the canonization of Benno.

‡ Cf. TIZIO, \*Hist. Senen. in Cod. G, II., 39, Chigi Library, Rome.

to Luther. Cardinal Medici blamed the Emperor severely, and when writing to Aleander at the end of March, he expressed his regret in lively language that such an imprudent and unpermissible thing as Luther's summons before the Diet should have taken place, which implied the suspension of the sentence against him and even against his books. Germany, which had always been the object of the Pope's predilection, was guilty of a shameful ingratitude, in thus acting to the detriment of the Empire. "His Holiness," continued the Cardinal, "will nevertheless not believe that Charles is willing to depart from the paths of his most Christian and most Catholic predecessors, and show himself ungrateful to God and the Holy See. Renewed discussion of this notorious and scandalous affair would bring disgrace on His Majesty. If Charles is able to effect so little against one man who is in his power, what could the Church and Christendom expect of him in a fight against Turks and infidels?" Aleander and Caracciolo were then urged to do all they could to influence the Emperor and his Council, as well as the Electors of Brandenburg and Mayence. But on no account were they to allow themselves to be drawn into a dispute with Luther; for by so doing, as Aleander had already so well pointed out, they would act in a way derogatory to the dignity of the Apostolic See.\*

In his report of the 8th of March, Aleander had mentioned a menacing utterance of the Imperial Great Chamberlain, Guillaume de Croy, Lord of Chièvres, from which he concluded that the imperialists wished to make use of the Lutheran affair to influence the Pope's

\* BALAN, n. 63. The date, April 15, given by Balan, is a mistake. The right date (the end of March) has been pointed out as correct by BRIEGER (297, n. 2). As to opinion in Rome, *cf.* the despatch of March 23, 1521, of Fantini, quoted by BALAN, VI., 39.



political attitude.\* The same news came to Rome from other sources ; and it was further rumoured that, though the Emperor had required Luther to renounce his false doctrines, he had left him a free hand to say anything he liked against the Pope.† However disquieting this might sound, the Pope was still careful to refrain from any expression which could betray his anxiety and need of assistance, and thus give to the Emperor's representative a handle to use against him. "Thank God," said he to Manuel on the 3rd of April, "that He has given to me at this time an Emperor who has the interests of the Church at heart." While he went on to beg Manuel to thank Charles for his good promises, he added the hope that the Emperor would keep them, and not allow persons who gave ear to the devil to lead him astray.‡ But on the 8th of April Leo's anxiety was too acute to be concealed, and Manuel sent a special courier to Worms to say that His Holiness was awaiting with the utmost impatience for news of Luther, who must, he thought, have arrived before the Diet by this time.§ Soon the Pope abandoned the attitude of reserve which he had hitherto observed. The

\* BALAN, n. 54 ; BRIEGER, n. 14. Cf. KALKOFF, 114 *seq.*, who pertinently remarks that Chièvres' threat was of no importance, as the treatment of the greater political questions had passed into the hands of Gattinara.

† Report of Manuel, March 27, 1521, in BERGENROTH, II., n. 326.

‡ "These are the exact words which His Holiness has commanded me to write to Your Majesty," says Manuel in a report of April 3, 1521. BERGENROTH, II., n. 327. On the same day the Venetian Ambassador reported a conversation he had had with the Pope about Luther ; see SANUTO, XXX., 130.

§ BERGENROTH, II., n. 328. KALKOFF (Forschungen, 81) published a special treatise about the contemporary business of the election of the Bishop of Havelberg, under the influence of the Lutheran movement, for the purpose of winning over the Elector Joachim I.

immediate cause of this change was Aleander's account of Luther's reception, the consideration shown by the Imperialists towards Saxony, and their subsequent attitude, which showed that they "reckoned more with man than with God." \* On the top of this came the tidings that Luther was to be allowed to hold a religious disputation. Leo at once sent for Manuel and told him plainly that such a dispute would, in his opinion, be a certain means of external injury to the Church. Manuel replied that he knew nothing about the alleged proposal, but that he was sure that the Emperor would see that the interests of God and of His Church were not prejudiced. "Leo X.," Manuel adds, "regards the Lutheran affair as a matter of the utmost importance, and until he is satisfied about this, nothing will be got out of him." †

The Pope must have spoken very strongly to the German Ambassador, for as lately as the 29th of March, Manuel had written to the Emperor about the possibility of bringing pressure to bear on the Pope by means of the Lutheran affair ; ‡ but he now begged him most urgently to satisfy His Holiness about this question of faith. Leo had not on his side held out any proposal of making political concessions in exchange for energetic action on the part of the Emperor against Luther. §

But Charles V. had no idea of turning the Lutheran affair to his own advantage politically. Just at that time he gave a clear proof of this. On the 18th of April, after Luther's first examination, and before the final decision of the affair, he sent Raffaello de' Medici to

\* BALAN, n. 64 ; BRIEGER, n. 22.

† Report of Manuel, April 27, 1521, in BERGENROTH, II., n. 329.

‡ Report of Manuel, March 29, in the Reichstagsakten, II., 866, n. 1.

§ Cf. BAUMGARTEN, Karl V., I., 436.

Rome to submit to the Pope the draft of a treaty of alliance.\*

\* SANUTO, XXX., 129 ; Reichstagsakten, 849, 866. WREDE points out the importance of Medici's mission at that moment as a proof that Charles did not wish to make use of Luther against the Pope. Before this EGELHAAF in his treatise, "Karls V. Stellung zur lutherischen Sache aud dem Wormser Reichstage," in the *Zeitschr. für allgem. Gesch.*, 1884, I., 686 *seq.*, and "Analekten zur Gesch., Stuttgart, 1886," had shown that, in this question, a distinction must be made between the Emperor and his counsellors, which Ranke, especially, has failed to make. EGELHAAF (*Analekten*, 273) justly remarks : "As we understand it, Charles threatened his ministers, and rejected their projects about Luther, except as a last resort in a case of extreme necessity. That, in any case, could do no harm ; and he who, as was believed, conducted matters independently, never thought of making use of this heretic for his own ends. He had indeed gradually come round to facilitating Luther's invitation to the Diet ; but he did not take this step to frighten the Pope or turn him against France. Rome was vulnerable on other points, and he had other means of bringing pressure to bear. The hundred and one 'grievances' of the German nation would, in case of necessity, serve the same or better purpose than favouring heresy, which would do as much harm in Spain as it could be of use in Germany or Italy. He invited Luther to Worms, so as not to affront the Germans, and to obtain his twenty-four thousand men, and in order, as he said to Aleander, 'not to mix up his own affairs with those of the Pope.' When his 'dissimular e temporeggiar' (BALAN, 253) had served their purpose, he would drop the mask. The Imperial counsellors in Rome and about Charles might see the possibility of using Luther as a battering-ram against the Pope, should the latter attach himself to France or countenance an attack on Naples." But Charles did not share this opinion. "Nowhere is there to be found one word which could indicate to Aleander, who was without doubt a shrewd observer, that the Emperor was not to be relied on" (*loc. cit.*, 271). Therefore BALAN'S (VI., 42 *seq.*) representations as to Charles's attitude are thoroughly distorted. KALKOFF (Aleander, 10) says most justly that Charles V. did not at all deny that Aleander's request to proceed against Luther was right in principle, and that the Emperor, at least in all the main points, declared himself decidedly on the side of Rome,

Medici arrived in Rome on the 30th of April.\* In the interval news had arrived there of Johann von der Ecken's skilful management of the case, so that even Giberti was of opinion that there was nothing left to be done except to follow up the victory over Luther. The joy felt in the immediate entourage of the Pope was as great as had been the dissatisfaction at the turn previously taken by the affair.†

Naturally the satisfaction was still greater when the Emperor made his strongly Catholic declaration on the 19th of April. In a Consistory held on the 10th of May, this, with the latest reports of the Nuncios in Germany and Spain, was read. Neither Pope nor Cardinals could praise the Emperor too highly; and the efforts of the Nuncios and all others concerned in the matter were most favourably acknowledged.‡ The Pope's recognition of the Catholic attitude of the Emperor, the Electors, Glapion, and other leading persons was expressed in special Briefs, coupled with the request that all these would continue in the same manner. In a Brief to Charles V., signed by the Pope himself, the latter says that the Emperor had surpassed all his expectations, and had acted as a true champion of

\* SANUTO, XXX., 188. On April 29 Cardinal Medici had, at the Nuncio's request, sent him the new version of the Bull *Decet*, in which Luther alone was mentioned by name. BALAN, n. 77.

† Giberti to Aleander, dat. Magliana, 1521, May 1. BALAN, n. 78. A commendatory Brief to Johann von der Ecken in SADOLETI Epist., 105 *seqq.*

‡ In a letter from Cardinal Medici, dated from Florence on May 12, 1521 (BALAN, n. 82), the Consistory is spoken of as having been held "hiermattina." Manuel (BERGENROTH, II., n. 334) gives no particular date. According to the Acta Consist. (KALKOFF, Forschungen, 81 *seq.*) it took place on the 10th of May. So also in TIZIO, \*Hist. Senen. in Cod. G, II., 39, f. 20, Chigi Library, Rome.



the Church.\* The Imperial declaration of April the 19th was—as was most unusual—sent at once in printed form to Rome.†

Meanwhile eager consultations went on in Rome with Raffaello de' Medici about the political alliance which was proposed between the Pope and the Emperor against France. Unexpected difficulties occurred, for, instead of the offensive alliance desired by Leo X., the draft of the treaty brought to Rome by Raffaello de' Medici only made mention of a defensive alliance. To this the Pope would not on any account consent. Although Manuel gave in at once, and altered the draft to meet the wishes of Leo X., the Pope put off signing from day to day. The fact is that the behaviour of the Emperor, who had so repeatedly—a thousand times, said Manuel—altered the draft, made Leo think that the power of Charles V. was not as great as had been represented.‡ Still greater was the effect produced on the timid Pope by a declaration published by France that she had concluded a treaty with the Swiss. To this was added the influence of England, which advised neutrality.§ More than ever before did his deeply-rooted indecision prevail with Leo X.||

\* BALAN, n. 84, 85, 86, 87, 88 ; *cf.* Reichstagsakten, II., 878, n. 1, previously published in SADOLETI Epist., 106 *seqq.*

† \*TIZIO, *loc. cit.*, reports this unprecedented circumstance. He says explicitly that the declaratio was “scripta lingua Gallica.” *Cf.* Vol. VII. of this work, p. 434.

‡ *Cf.* BERGENROTH, II., n. 334, 335, 336. ULMANN (Studien, II., 113) tries to explain the obscurity which surrounded the negotiations between Charles and the Pope, and the new hesitation on the part of the latter, by the supposition that Charles wished to obtain a higher price for his alliance than the formal concession about the investiture of the crown of Naples, and therefore was so dilatory in his treaties with the Pope.

§ NITTI, 416 *seq.*

|| ULMANN, Studien, II., 113.

The Pope's hesitation kindled fresh hopes among the French diplomatists in Rome, the Count of Carpi and the Lord of Gisors. Leo X. fanned these hopes by a declaration which sounded most favourable to France. Knowing how bent the Pope was on the possession of Ferrara, the French held out hopes to him of its possession, as well as of the increase of the States of the Church by the strip of coast in the kingdom of Naples. All this made such an impression on Leo that, as far as we can trust Carpi's reports, he appeared to be willing to agree with the demands of French policy.\* On the top of this came the daily and increasing financial difficulty, which affected the Emperor as well as the Pope.† When Carpi at length announced that the alliance between France and the Swiss cantons was an accomplished fact, Leo expressed himself in such terms that the French Ambassador was full of hopes.‡

It did not escape Manuel that fear was the chief motive which drew Leo X. towards France. He therefore advised his Imperial master to try the influence of fear in another direction, by concluding a treaty with England, by alienating the Swiss from France, by entering into negotiations with France herself, and by threatening to call a General Council.§ Without waiting for the decision of the Emperor, Manuel wrote to the Viceroy of Naples to send a force from the Abruzzi to the borders of the States of the Church, so as to make an impression in Rome.||

\* BERGENROTH, II., n. 337; BAUMGARTEN, Karl V., I., 501 *seq.*; NITTI, 418 *seq.* As to Carpi's report, see HÖFLER in the *Hist. Jahrb.*, VI., 552 *seq.*

† NITTI, 423, draws especial attention to this.

‡ BAUMGARTEN, Karl V., I., 503.

§ BERGENROTH, II., n. 334, 337.

|| *Ibid.*, n. 334. A movement on the Neapolitan border must recoil on Rome, all the more as there were thousands of Spaniards in the

But, before this extreme measure was resorted to, Leo X. had made up his mind in favour of the Emperor. The French had gone too far. Leo X. had heard that Lautrec had said that he would leave nothing to the Pope except his ears.\* All the evil which the French had done to him as Cardinal and Pope now came back into his mind.† The last blow was when Francis I., contrary to his many promises, tried to draw the Duke of Ferrara, together with the Swiss, into an alliance with him.‡ On the 29th of May Manuel was able to tell the Emperor that the Pope had signed the contract and sent it to him by Raffaello de' Medici, but that it was to be kept strictly secret for the present.§ Girolamo Adorno and Cardinal Medici had especially helped the Imperial Ambassador in obtaining this result.||

The offensive alliance, dated the 8th of May, gives prominence to the great mediæval idea of the combination of the two great powers, the Papal and the Imperial, set up by God above all other powers. The "two real heads of Christendom" were to unite "in purifying it from all error, in establishing universal peace, in fighting the infidel, and in introducing a better state of things throughout."

Eternal City who could threaten the Pope at his very doors; see BALAN, VI., 31, n. 4.

\* Leo himself related this to the Venetian Ambassador, Gradenigo. ALBÈRI, 2nd Series, III., 70.

† Cf. JOVIUS, Vita, lib. 4.

‡ This intelligence did not rest, as NITTI (429) thinks, on a false report; see Eidgenöss. Abschiede IV., 1a, 20 seq., and BERNAYS in the Histor. Zeitschr., LXXIV., 517. Cf. also BAUMGARTEN, Karl V., I., 511.

§ See Manuel's report of May 29, 1521, in BERGENROTH, II., n. 338.

|| VETTORI, 333; GUICCIARDINI, XIV., 1; and to these add BERGENROTH, II., n. 346, about the reward given to Cardinal Medici by Charles V.

The cause of all the present evil was France's lust of conquest, which had led her to seize on Milan and Genoa, to threaten poor Italy and the independence of the Holy See. In order to restore order and tranquillity, this peace-destroying member must be attacked with fire and sword, and the usurpations of France in Italy must be stopped. Therefore Milan and Genoa should be invested by the Imperial and Papal troops in September, and freed from the French yoke; and the Sforza and Adorni should be set up again as vassals of the Empire. All territories belonging to the Pope should be restored to him, especially Parma and Piacenza, and also Ferrara. Moreover, the Emperor pledged himself in the fullest sense to protect the Pope against his enemies and against all who attacked the true faith and defamed the Holy See, and guaranteed the dominion of the Medici in Tuscany. On his side Leo X. bound himself solemnly and in perpetuity to Charles, promising him a new investiture of the crown of Naples, and assistance in defending it, as also in enforcing his Imperial rights on Venice.\*

The Pope gained most by this important agreement. When the conditions relating to Italy were carried out, the Emperor would be no more powerful than he had been before; whereas the States of the Church would be so considerably increased that the independence of the Holy See, so long desired by Leo X., would probably be assured.† A still greater advantage to the Holy See was

\* Secret Archives of the Vatican, Arm., IV., caps. 3, f. 166-170b (authentic copy in Archives of the Spanish Embassy in Rome), printed in DUMONT, IV., 3, 96 *seq.* THEINER, Cod. III., 524 *seqq.*; *cf.* BALAN, VI., 45. For the Bulls which allowed the Emperor to hold the crown of Naples together with that of the Empire, determined feudal obligations, and raised the census, see RAYNALDUS, 1521, n. 81 *seqq.*, and DUMONT, Suppl., II., 1, 67 *seq.*; *cf.* LANZ, Einleitung, 256 *seq.*

† VETTORI, 334; NITTI, 456.



the protection against all enemies of the Catholic Faith which was now solemnly promised by Charles.\*

Thus did the highest spiritual and secular powers unite once more for the protection of the ancient faith in the Holy Roman Empire, at the very moment when the storm against the old order of things was let loose.†

The Curia was quite confident that Rome would succeed in mastering the heretical outburst, thanks to the issue of the Edict of Worms. The satisfaction felt by the Pope at the promulgation of the new Imperial law against Lutheranism was strongly expressed by Cardinal Medici in his letters to Aleander. The Nuncio was charged to convey the Pope's warmest thanks to the Emperor and all who had contributed to the carrying out of the important measure.‡ On the 7th of June the great news was communicated to the Cardinals in Consistory.§ Afterwards, Luther's picture and his writings were burned in the Piazza Navona in Rome.||

However well aware Cardinal Medici might be of the zeal shown by Aleander at Worms, of his fidelity to duty

\* That this consideration weighed very much in the conclusion of the treaty is stated by GUICCIARDINI, XIV., 1.

† The importance of this is stated by modern writers, especially by HÖFLER, *Kaiserthum*, 190, and BUSCH, *Vermittlungspolitik*, 112.

‡ Medici to Aleander, from Florence, June 6, 1521, in BALAN, n. 99.

§ Acta Consist. in KALKOFF, *Forschungen*, 82.

|| That this act, which is placed by ENDERS (II., 64) and RENAZZI (II., 43) in 1520, really took place in 1521, is shown by KALKOFF (*Prozess*, 578), who appeals to the first edition of BERNHARD VON LUXEMBURG, *Catal. haeretic.*, LIIIb., and the report of PLANITZ (*Wülcker-Virck*, 602). This is corroborated by TIZIO, *\*Hist. Senen*. In this the act is dated a day sooner than in Bernhard von Luxemburg. *\*Praeterea Iunii undecima marti dicata Rome in Naone simulacrum Martini Luterii publice crematum est tamquam heretici et opuscula illius quamplurima fetenti admixto lumine ita ut circumstantes ferre non valerent.* Cod. G, II., 39, f. 28b, in the Chigi Library, Rome.

and his energy, he never ceased in his efforts to spur the Nuncio on to fresh measures against the heresy.\* It did not escape the Cardinal's shrewd observation that at times Aleander indulged in over-optimistic hopes.† These were not shared in Rome, chiefly on account of the disturbing news which came from Germany through the Minorites there.‡

In the Netherlands Aleander's zeal had achieved great things; but in Saxony the new doctrines were being spread with ever-increasing rapidity under the protection of the Elector. The hopes to which Luther's retirement to the Castle of Wartburg gave birth proved vain, and showed that Rome had not overrated the danger. On the 18th of September, 1521, Aleander was charged to make urgent representations to the Emperor about the "Saxon scandals." If the injunctions of the Edict of Worms were disregarded now, while the ink with which it was written was scarcely dry, he was commissioned to say: What would the Elector of Saxony not dare do when Charles had departed from Germany? If matters were not taken in hand now, at the beginning of the evil, the last state of things would be worse than the first.§

Had it been better known in Rome how the German people were being incited in print and from the pulpit to abolish Catholic worship and even to murder priests,|| the fear would have been still greater. As it was, anxiety was very acute in spite of Aleander's more or less favourable reports. The only thing which allayed this anxiety

\* Cf. BALAN, 266 *seq.*, 277 *seq.*; KALKOFF, *Capito*, 43.

† Cf. the Letters of June 27 and July 6, in BALAN, pp. 261, 274; BRIEGER, pp. 241, 244; cf. PAQUIER, 278.

‡ See TIZIO, \*Hist. Senen., *loc. cit.*, Chigi Library, Rome.

§ BALAN, n. 124, p. 291 *seq.*; cf. 292 *seq.*

|| JANSSEN-PASTOR, II.<sup>18</sup>, 198 *seqq.*

was the fact that other countries of Christendom did not seem to have adopted Luther's errors. In Italy, it is true, there were some who sympathized with him ;\* but teachers of his heresy were few and far between ;† and in Spain and Portugal the new doctrines had produced no effect whatever.‡ Even the Polish King, Sigismund, issued, on July 26th, 1521, a severe edict against the spread of Lutheran literature.§ It is true that the news from Denmark was disquieting ; but Leo X. hoped to avert the worst consequences by the exercise of great gentleness towards the King.|| In France, in spite of his political antagonism to the Pope, Francis I. ordered that all Luther's works should be burnt in Paris.¶ It was of no small importance that the distinguished theological faculty of Paris, on April 15th, 1521, condemned Luther's doctrines as emphatically as Louvain and Cologne had already done in 1519.\*\* Although Aleander blamed the omission of all mention of the primacy of the Pope in the condemnation by the University of Paris, he hoped that even so, the censure of a body of theologians so generally respected would

\* Cf. *infra*, pp. 181-182.

† For more about this, see *infra*, p. 178.

‡ On August 20, 1521, Leo wrote to the King of Portugal to express his delight at Emanuel's having declared himself against Luther. This is the gist of the letter of April 20, in BALAN, n. 72 ; see Corp. Dipl. Port., II., 47-48.

§ Acta Tomic., V., 284.

|| See *infra*, pp. 451 *seq.*, 454.

¶ BALAN, p. 282 ; BRIEGER, p. 237.

\*\* Determinatio super doctrina Lutheri hactenus revisa, in DU PLESSIS D'ARGENTRÉ, I., 2, 365-375. Cf. HEFELE-HERGENRÖTHER, IX., 159 *seq.* ; DELISLE, Un registre des procès-verbaux de la faculté de théologie de Paris, Paris, 1899 ; KÖHLER in the Allg. Ztg., 1900, Beil. 213 ; and FÉRET, La faculté de théologie de Paris ; Époque mod., I., Paris, 1900.

not fail to have a good effect even in Germany.\* Great joy was caused in Rome by the action of the King of England, who attacked Luther in a book written by himself. The University of Oxford had already condemned Luther's writings.† The manner in which the Pope received the book of Henry VIII. shows that he, at any rate, considered the Lutheran affair as by no means suppressed.‡

\* Cf. BALAN, p. 201 ; BRIEGER, p. 257.

† DU PLESSIS D'ARGENTRÉ, I., 2, 380 *seq.*

‡ Cf. *infra*, Chapter IV., Vol. VIII.



## CHAPTER II.

### DEFEAT OF THE FRENCH AND INCREASE OF THE STATES OF THE CHURCH.—DEATH OF LEO X.

WHILE the alliance between the Pope and the Emperor was being carefully kept secret, hostilities had already begun. Francis I. did not hesitate to profit by the difficulties in which Charles V. was placed by the insurrection of the Spanish towns on the one side, and by the Lutheran movement on the other, and seized the opportunity to wrest Navarre from him.\* At the same time he favoured the attempt made in the Netherlands by Robert de la Marck. While fighting was going on in the Pyrenees and Luxemburg, the war began in Italy, and at first with unfavourable results for the Pope and Emperor.

Leo's former anger with Alfonso of Ferrara broke out afresh when he defied the spiritual authority of the Holy See by favouring a monk named Andrea da Ferrara,† who was suspected of disseminating Lutheran doctrines. However, the first attempts of the Papal force against Ferrara failed.‡ So also did an attack made on Genoa by the

\* Francis had formed private relations with the Spanish insurgents; see SALLES in the *Rev. d. quest. hist.*, 1900, II., 55 *seq.*

† Cf., about this monk, SANUTO, XXIX., 492, 552, 561, 609, 614-615, XXX., 53-54; and *Arch. Veneto*, N.S.V. (1893), 249 *seqq.*, and the despatch in BALAN, VI., 48 *seq.*

‡ Alfonso of Ferrara and his panegyrist Pistofilo accused the Pope later of an attempt to murder the Duke on this occasion. MURATORI

Imperial and Papal ships in combination with the Adorni party.\* No better success attended the attempt of those who had been banished from Milan to stir up an insurrection in Lombardy, where the people were possessed of a wild hatred of the harsh government of the French. Venice betrayed the danger which was threatening France, and measures were taken to frustrate the plot. But the French soon learned that the versatile and intriguing Vice-Chancellor of Maximilian Sforza, Girolamo Morone, had left Trent for Reggio, richly provided with money, and had gathered round him a large number of Milanese who had unjustly been driven out of Milan by the French.† Thomas de Lescun, brother of the Governor Lautrec, tried to put a check on Morone's far-reaching plans by a bold invasion of the territories of the Holy See. In the night between the 23rd and 24th of June, Lescun appeared before Reggio with an armed force, and demanded the delivery to him of the Milanese exiles. His intention, though its success was very doubtful, was to take posses-

(Antich. Est., II., 323) has accepted this story ; but the best-informed contemporaries, such as Guicciardini, Jovius (*Vita Alphonsi*), Lancellotti, Giraldi, Zerbinati, know nothing of any such an attempt. ROSCOE-HENKE (II., 461) have therefore rejected the accusation brought against Leo X. This did not prevent DE LEVA (II., 52-53) from repeating it. But since him CAPPELLI (*Atti Mod.*, III., 517, and *Lett. di Ariosto*, Bologna, 1866), and also BALAN (VI., 50), have proved that the "Prozessakten" in the State Archives, Modena, accepted by Muratori as authentic, are absolutely untrustworthy, and the accusation must be rejected as an invention of Alfonso's ; *cf.* also BALAN, VI., App. XIX.

\* GUICCIARDINI, XIV., I.

† According to DU BELLAY (*Mém.*, II., 129) the number of the Milanese exiled by Lautrec was as great as that of those who remained ; and it was said that they were banished for the most trifling reasons, or because they possessed money. This made many enemies to France. *Cf.* SISMONDI, XIV., 522.

sion of the town. However, the watchfulness of the Governor of Reggio, the historian Francesco Guicciardini, saved this important place.\*

This attack on Papal territory by the French gave Leo X. the desired opportunity of declaring himself openly against France. The few diplomatists in whom the Pope confided, became aware, on the 22nd of June, that he was waiting for only one thing before he declared war.† In a postscript to his report of the 25th of June, Castiglione was able to tell his master of the decision which had been till then so carefully kept secret;‡ but it was not until the 27th that he was able to speak of the influence which the attack on Reggio had had on the Pope's decision.§

In a Consistory held on the 27th of June, the Pope complained of the violation of the borders of the States of the Church, and declared to the Cardinals that for the sake of self-protection he wished to ally himself with the

\* Cf. GUICCIARDINI'S Report of June 24, 1521, in his *Opere ined.*, VII., n. 136, and *Storia*, XIV., 2. As to Lautrec's evil intention, see also GRUMELLO, 264, and CAPPELLA, 6-8. Guicciardini was made Governor of Modena in June, 1516, and of Reggio in July, 1517. (CHIESI, 63 *seq.*, 65 *seq.*, says Guicciardini became Governor of Modena in April, 1516, and of Reggio in December, 1516.) As such he carried out military proceedings in Rome in 1521 against the robber baron Domenico d'Amorotto, who had many patrons in the Curia; cf. LIVI, *Il Guicciardini e Domenico d'Amorotto, Reggio*, 1875; Nuova ediz., 1879.

† \*N. S. si è molto rallegrato meco et hami detto, che aspetta una risposta la quale subito venuta pensa risolversi Spagnolo et hami detto molto male de Francesi et ben del imperatore. \*Report in cypher from B. Castiglione to the Marquis of Mantua, dated from Rome, June 22, 1521, Gonzaga Archives, Mantua.

‡ \*Il Papa è risoluto Spagnolo e totalmente inimico de Francesi. . . . Il Papa ha tenuto tanto secreta questa sua resolutione che non si può dire più. \*Letter of Castiglione's of June 25, 1521, *loc. cit.*

§ \*Letter of Castiglione, June 27, 1521, *loc. cit.*



Emperor, who had recently stood up at the Diet of Worms as the defender of the Church.\* The treaty of May, which had been so successfully kept secret, was now to all appearances concluded for the first time, and communicated to England and Switzerland.† “The Pope has dropped his mask and allied himself to Charles V.,” wrote the disconcerted Venetian Ambassador, Gradenigo, on the 29th of June.‡ On the same day, without any concealment, Leo accepted the white palfrey from the Emperor’s representative, in token of the investiture of Charles V. with the crown of Naples. In the presence of all the Ambassadors, Leo X. complained of the behaviour of Francis I., who had kept no agreement, and had supported the Dukes of Ferrara and Urbino against him. He now openly declared himself the enemy of the French.§

With feverish haste, and in spite of the warnings of Rucellai, who was still in France,|| Rome made preparations for the accomplishment of her great object, the expulsion of the French from Italy. The Pope hoped to effect this before long.¶ To raise money he pledged his silver plate, and spoke of obtaining funds later by a great nomination of Cardinals. The opposition of many members of the Sacred College to the Imperial and anti-French policy was

\* Report of Castiglione, June 28, 1521; BASCHET, Catherine de Médicis, 265.

† Cf. GUICCIARDINI, XIV., 2.

‡ SANUTO, XXX., 468. BUSCH (Vermittlungspolitik, 120) also shows how well the secret of the May treaty had been kept.

§ Cf. BERGENROTH, II., n. 343, 344; BREWER, III., 2, n. 1400, 1402, 1403; BUSCH, Vermittlungspolitik, 120-121.

|| Cf. Mél. d’archéol., 1886, 267 *seq.*

¶ \*Il Papa spera di cacciare prestissimo i Francesi de Italia. B. Castiglione to the Marquis of Mantua, dated from Rome, June 29, 1521. Gonzaga Archives, Mantua.



not heeded by Leo: Cardinal Medici was the only one with whom he took counsel.\*

The plan of war was discussed with the German Ambassador. Prospero Colonna was sent for to Rome and given the supreme command of the allied forces. The Marquis Federigo Gonzaga had been named Captain-General of the Church in April. This appointment had been kept secret, and was made known only at the beginning of July.† Francesco Guicciardini was confirmed as Commissary-General of the army, and was appointed to accompany the Marquis, armed with extensive powers; Ferrante d'Avalos, Marquis of Pescara, the husband of Vittoria Colonna, so famed as a poetess, received the command of the Imperial infantry; while Giovanni de' Medici, who later made for himself a formidable name as leader of the Black Companies, was to command the Papal cavalry. The whole force of the allies was put at six hundred Papal and Florentine heavy cavalry and as many Imperialists, together with six thousand Spanish, six thousand Italian, and six thousand Swiss infantry.‡

As soon as he learned about the alliance between the

\* SANUTO, XXXI., 13, 185, 317, 404, 458; XXXII., 8. BERGEN-ROTH, II., n. 345, 346, 351.

† Cf. the rare and valuable document: *Delle esenzioni della famiglia Castiglione e della loro origine e fondamento*, Mantova, 1780, 6 *seq.*, 28 *seqq.*, in which many of the deeds in the Gonzaga Archives are made use of; see also MARTINATI, 37 *seq.*; LUZIO-RENIER, Mantova, 247, and *Giorn. ligust.*, 1890, 441; \*Letter of Castiglione, July 6, 1521 (Gonzaga Archives, Mantua), Appendix, No. 19. About the appointment of Federigo Gonzaga as Captain-General of the Church, A. Luzio is about to publish a special monograph.

‡ \*Letter of J. Ginodi to the Duke of Savoy, dated from Rome on July 8, 1521, State Archives, Turin, Roma, I.; GUICCIARDINI, XIV., 2; CAPELLA, 14 *seq.*; JOVIUS, *Vita Alf. Piscarii*; REUMONT, V. Colonna, 39 *seq.*

Pope and the Emperor, Francis made several attempts to win back the former, and thus allay the tempest which threatened him; when he failed he foamed with rage. On the 13th of July he published a manifesto to his subjects in Italy in which he complained of the ingratitude of Leo, for whom he had done so much. He expressed his confidence that the Pope would reap neither honour nor benefit from his alliance with the Catholic King: it was thus that he styled Charles, for he would not give the title of Emperor to his rival. Soon after, he issued a mandate forbidding, under severe penalties, the transfer to Rome of the incomes of any French bishopric or abbey.\* At the beginning of August he declared in his boastful way that "he would ere long enter Rome and impose laws on the Pope."† His army was by no means equal in strength to that of his opponents, but he trusted to the assistance of the Venetians as well as to that of the warlike Duke of Ferrara. He also counted on the co-operation of the Swiss.

Meanwhile Leo X. had been overjoyed by the news of the repulse of the attack of the French on Navarre.‡ By a Bull of the 27th of July, he threatened Thomas de Lescun and his fellow-culprits with excommunication and interdict, if they did not within twelve days make satisfaction for the attack on Reggio, their encroachment on matters of ecclesiastical jurisdiction, and their violation of the agreement

\* MOLINI, I., 97-98; NITTI, 439.

† JANSSEN-PASTOR, II.<sup>18</sup>, 331.

‡ \*Ha poi S. S<sup>ta</sup> [aviso] per lettere duplicate pur di Franza che Francesi hanno havuto grandissimo danno nel regno di Navarra et che con perdita de gente assai et de artiglieria hanno abbandonato quella impresa, il che essendo così è cosa de grandissimo momento. B. Castiglione to the Marquis of Mantua, dat. Rome, July 20, 1521. Gonzaga Archives, Mantua.

about the purchase of salt.\* Charles did not think that the Pope went far enough in this, and, through his Ambassador, urged Leo to pronounce excommunication on the person of the French King. But the Pope would not proceed to such severe measures. In fact, among the many anxieties which at that time gave him sleepless nights,† was the dread of being left in the lurch by the Emperor and given over to the vengeance of France. Charles heard that this was the case, and sent an autograph letter to the Pope in which he promised expressly to come to no understanding with France without a previous agreement with Leo. Baldassare Castiglione saw this important letter on the 2nd of August, 1521.‡ In return for this the Pope published without further delay the nomination as Cardinal of Eberhard de la Mark, this having been resolved on in a Consistory held on the 9th of August.§ As to how the consent of Leo was gained, is shown by a report sent by Clerk to Wolsey. In consequence of the tidings that the Turks were maltreat-

\* Bull *Regis pacifici*, D, 1512, VI., Cal. Augusti. Secret., 1202, f. 136. Secret Archives of the Vatican. Cf. SANUTO, XXXI., 261, 498 *seq.* Printed copies of this "monitorium poenale" are most rare. I found one in the Rossiana Library at Vienna (XV., 397, 10).

† SANUTO, XXX., 466.

‡ \*Della tregua che de Francesi vanno jactando non è vero et io hoggi ho veduto una lettera a N. S. dello imperatore di mano propria nella quale S. M<sup>ta</sup> promette di non fare apuntamento alcuno con Francesi senza il consenso del papa el quale tiene ancor per certo che Inghilterra debba essere contro Franza. Castiglione to the Marquis of Mantua, Rome, Aug. 2, 1521. Gonzaga Archives, Mantua.

§ \*Acta Consist., in Consistorial Archives; PARIS DE GRASSIS, \*Diarium (Secret Archives of the Vatican); and \*Letter of B. Castiglione to the Marquis of Mantua, Aug. 9, 1521 (Gonzaga Archives, Mantua). Cf. BERGENROTH, II., n. 349, 350, 351, 352, 353. The sending of the red hat to Eberhard de la Mark followed on Sept. 18; see the \*Brief to him on that day, Arm., XLIV., t. 5, f. 142. Secret Archives of the Vatican.



ing the Hungarians, the Pope was very much depressed; though he did not allow this to affect his anti-French policy. Indeed he did not shrink from saying that he would not undertake anything against the Turks until he had reduced France to such a condition that she was not able to move. The Pope said that he would pledge his tiara rather than not drive the French out of Italy.\* The Emperor encouraged Leo in this frame of mind by the assurance that he was determined to exercise his whole strength against France.† In a second autograph letter the Emperor informed Leo of the first move he had made against France, and of his determination to carry on the war with all his might.‡

Leo X., who had asked the assistance of the King of Portugal and his fleet,§ indulged in hopes which were increased by the likelihood, as he thought, of England's turning against France. He treated the boasting of the latter with contempt,|| and by calculating the strength

\* Clerk to Wolsey, Aug. 8, 1521; BREWER, III., 2, n. 1477.

† \*N. S. ogni dì piu ha avisi de la ferma deliberatione di Cesare contra Franza e di volere esporre tutte le forze sue senza riservo alcuno in questa impresa. \*B. Castiglione to the Marquis of Mantua, dated from Rome, Aug. 12, 1521. Gonzaga Archives, Mantua.

‡ \*Dui dì sono S. S<sup>ta</sup> ha havuta un' altra lettera de mano propria de lo imperatore dove S. M. gli avisa che in ogni modo alli VII. di questo se aviarà alla volta di Franza con uno exercito grossissimo e conforta S. S<sup>ta</sup> a non abandonare la impresa nè raffreddare punto si che N. S. è animatissimo. B. Castiglione to the Marquis of Mantua, Aug. 12, 1521. Gonzaga Archives, Mantua.

§ Brief of Aug. 12, 1521, in the Corp. Dipl. Port., II., 43 *seqq.*

|| Ha ancor S. S<sup>ta</sup> aviso che'l re d'Anglitterra se dichiarerà amico dell' imperatore e suo contra Franza e così ha promisso el card. d'Anglitterra, il quale ha mostrato al homo del papa le lettere de Francesi tutte piene de bugie e tra l'altre cose hanno scritto là che hanno nel campo contra el Papa trentaquattro milia fanti e che l'exercito nostro se retira continuamente e che loro sperano che non passerà



of both sides, he believed that he might count on swift and certain victory.\*

There were, however, moments when Leo did not feel sure of the Emperor. The mediation of England and the suggestions of France both shook his confidence.† In consequence of this mistrust—which was quite unfounded—he hesitated to pronounce excommunication on Francis I.‡ But at last, on the 4th of September, he made up his mind, and threatened the French King and his generals with greater excommunication and interdict if they did not, within fifteen days, lay down their arms and deliver over Parma and Piacenza to the Holy See. The reasons alleged by the Pope were that Francis had carried on war with Charles by use of the money granted to him by the tithe for the Crusade, that he had violated the Concordat and ecclesiastical liberty, attacked Reggio, seized the revenues of the Church, arrested Florentine merchants in Lyons, and, finally, kept unjust possession of Parma and Piacenza.§

venti dì che seranno a Napoli et altre baie di questa sorte. B. Castiglione to the Marquis of Mantua, dated from Rome, Aug. 19, 1521. Gonzaga Archives, Mantua.

\* \*B. Castiglione to the Marquis of Mantua, dated from Rome, Aug. 23, 1521. Gonz. Archives, Mantua; see Appendix, No. 20.

† When Wolsey and Charles V. met in the middle of August, they agreed secretly on no less a measure than the partition of France between them! The French were deluded in every way by Wolsey. BERGENROTH, II., n. 355; BROSCHE, England, VI., 146–152. As to the particular way in which the Pope learned about the treaty, see BUSCH, *Vermittlungspolitik*, 135 *seq.* Previously a futile attempt had been made by the mother of Francis I. to induce Charles to break with the Pope, and great concessions were offered to him if he would leave France a free hand to take vengeance on Leo X.; but the Emperor rejected all these overtures as incompatible with his honour. See Contarini's Report, July 20, 1521, in BROWN, III., n. 266.

‡ BERGENROTH, II., n. 356, 357. Cf. DE LEVA, II., 118–119.

§ An authentic copy of this declaration is printed in DUMONT, *Suppl.* VOL. VIII.

Meanwhile the news which came from the theatre of war in Northern Italy was far from reassuring. At the end of August the Pope daily expected tidings of the taking of Parma: \* instead, there came, on the 10th of September, the intelligence that the siege of the city had been raised.† The Curia had taken matters so lightly, that Castiglione wrote on the 4th of September that he had every day to argue with those who did not understand in the slightest degree what war was, and who thought that soldiers could fly.‡ All the greater and more painful was the disillusionment. The cause of the check was the conduct of the Swiss, on whom till now Leo had set all his hopes,§ as well as the want of agreement among the generals of the allied force.

The Nuncio, Pucci, who had been sent to Switzerland as Legate *a latere* in July, 1521, together with Filonardi and Cardinal Schinner, were employed by the Emperor for the raising of troops in the cantons. They met with great

du tome, III., 70-73; *cf.* HEFELE-HERGENRÖTHER, IX., 267, n. 2. Archives of the Spanish Embassy in Rome.

\* On August 30 Castiglione wrote to the Marquis of Mantua: \*N. S. sta in continua aspettatione che Parma si batta o che la sia presa perchè pare a S. S<sup>ta</sup> che lo exercito suo sia tanto superiore de lo inimico che la ragion vorrebbe che si sentisse qualche cosa segnalata. *Cf.* also the \*Letter of Castiglione of August 28. Gonzaga Archives, Mantua.

† SANUTO, XXXI., 374, 404, 452.

‡ \*N. S. sta in grande aspettatione de intendere che la cosa de Parma succeda bene e fin tanto che di questo non se ha nova S. S<sup>ta</sup> non starà troppo allegra. Io tutto il giorno e tutte l'hore ho da fare per contrastare con molti di qua che non hanno mai visto arme e pensano che sia una facil cosa pigliare una terra guardata e difesa e che gli homini possino volare. Gonzaga Archives, Mantua.

§ On September 9, 1521, Castiglione thus reported to his Marquis: \*S. S<sup>ta</sup> tiene per certo di haver Suizeri e che quelli che sono con li Francesi se ne partiranno. Gonzaga Archives, Mantua.

difficulties, because all the cantons, with the exception of Zurich, had formed a treaty with France at the beginning of May, 1521, one of the clauses of which was directed against this very recruiting by a foreign power. In spite of all Filonardi's representations, the twelve cantons remained obstinate in their refusal to send troops to the Pope. Zurich granted two thousand men, but only on condition that they were to be employed solely in the defence of Papal territory.\*

Under these circumstances the allies did not feel themselves strong enough to take Parma, although they had been joined by about six thousand German landsknechte. But they were insufficiently prepared, and there was want of unity in the army; and when, added to this, they learned that the Duke of Ferrara was advancing against them, the leaders of the allied troops considered it prudent to abandon the siege. They fell back, about three thousand strong, on San Lazzaro, in the direction of Reggio. The mercenaries murmured loudly from discontent with their pay, and it was feared that they might go over to the French. Had the enemy taken the offensive at that moment, no doubt they would have come off victorious.†

The position of the allies was all the more critical because of the mutual distrust which hampered their actions. The Papal generals inclined to the view that the Imperialists had abandoned the siege of Parma at the approach of an inferior force, solely because they did not wish to take the

\* Cf. WIRZ, Filonardi, 51-53, Archiv für schweiz. Gesch., XVI., xviii.

† This is the decided opinion of GUICCIARDINI (XIV. 2). Contemporaries differ about the raising of the siege of Parma and its causes; cf. BUSCH, Vermittlungspolitik, 154, n. 4, and BALAN, VI., 53, n. 3. There are interesting details about what went on at Parma, in the reports of the Sienese soldiers in TIZIO, \*Hist. Senen., Cod. G, II., 39, f. 43 of the Chigi Library, Rome.

town for the Pope. On the other hand, Prospero Colonna suspected that Leo X. would withdraw from the war as soon as Parma and Piacenza had been regained. When the news arrived that the French had been joined by more Swiss troops at Cremona, the allies retreated on Reggio. They would, no doubt, have retreated further, had not the agents of the Pope and Emperor combined to hinder them.\*

Meanwhile, a change had taken place in Switzerland which was to be of the utmost importance. Filonardi, and still more the impetuous Schinner,† succeeded at last in getting together a considerable body of Swiss mercenaries. In order to effect a junction with these, Prospero Colonna crossed the Po at Casalmaggiore, on the 1st of October. Here he was joined by Cardinal Medici, who, at the end of September, had been appointed Legate to the army, to arrange the differences between Colonna and Pescara. He took large sums of money with him.‡ The allies now advanced to the Oglio, and it seemed as if the fortune of war was going to turn in their favour. It was of the greatest advantage to them that, just at that juncture, Lautrec lost a good opportunity of combining with the Venetians and attacking the enemy at Robecco. Instead of doing this he retired to a fortified position behind the Adda.§ Nearly at the same time the Duke of Ferrara suffered a severe defeat at Modena, which

\* GUICCIARDINI, XIV., 2. As to the strength of the army, see Guicciardini's report of Sept. 15, 1521, in *Opere inedite*, VII., n. 157.

† Cf. BLÖSCH, Kardinal Schinner, Berne, 1891, 14 *seq.*

‡ Cf. BERGENROTH, II., n. 359; JOVIUS, *Vita Leonis X.*, lib. 4. See the \*deed of appointment of Card. Medici of Sept. 30, 1521 (*Secret Archives of the Vatican*), in Appendix, No. 21.

§ GUICCIARDINI, XIV., 3. About Lautrec's mistake, see RANKE, *Deutsche Gesch.*, II.<sup>2</sup>, 281,



compelled him to fall back on his capital.\* A manifesto which he sent to the Emperor was full of the most violent accusations against the Pope, and did not improve his position.†

The Swiss, recruited by Schinner, had meanwhile advanced from Chiavenna into the territory of Bergamo,‡ although they had not yet decided whether they would act directly against the French. In spite of all the arguments of Cardinals Schinner and Schönberg, the men of Zurich were resolute in maintaining that they had been engaged solely for the protection of the States of the Church. On this understanding they consented to march on Reggio, with the ulterior object of reconquering Parma and Piacenza for the Pope. For a long time the remaining six thousand Swiss refused to come to any decision; but at last, at the end of October, Schinner persuaded them to join Gambara with the Papal-Spanish force. He hoped that from this they would go on with him and make a descent on Milan; in this was he not mistaken. Cardinals Medici and Schinner were with this force, to what was,

\* GUICCIARDINI, XIV., 3; LANCELOTTI, 204; BALAN, VI., 54.

† Alfonso's manifesto appeared in print after Leo's death; a complete refutation of it was published by an anonymous adherent of the late Pope's on the 6th of January, 1522, which was translated into Italian, and published in Rome under the title of: *Resposta alla invectiva qui annexa Don Alphonso già duca di Ferrara publicata contra la s. e glor. mem. di Leone X. sotto pretexto de una littera scripta alla Ces. M<sup>ta</sup>. Translata di latino in vulgare*. A copy of this very rare pamphlet is in the Library of Ferrara. Epitome of both writings are in CAPPELLI, *Lett. di L. Ariosto*, 3 ediz., Milano, 1887. Cf. *Carte Stroz.*, II., 469, and TIZIO, \*Hist. Senen in the Cod. G, II., 39, f. 69b of the Chigi Library, Rome. The original of the Bulla excommunicationis et privationis Alphonsi, dat. 1521, XVII., Cal. Dec. (15 Nov.), in the State Archives, Modena.

‡ On October 7 they were at Chiavenna, and on the 12th at Bergamo; Eidgenöss. Abschiede, IV., 1, 126.

according to Guicciardini, the abuse of religion ; for there were the Cardinals, with their legatine crosses, mixed up with the whole crew of plundering, blaspheming murderers.\* The union of the Papal and Spanish troops with the Swiss, which Lautrec and his Venetian allies had been unable to prevent, had given the allies an undoubted superiority.

Soon fortune turned her back on the French. The Swiss serving in their army, who had for some time been affronted by Lautrec's insolence and attitude of suspicion, now clamoured for their pay. As, in spite of all promises, and as a result of bad organization, this grievance was not satisfied, the mercenaries deserted in numbers. The discontent of the Swiss was, moreover, fomented by agents from their own cantons, who urged them on no account to fight against their fellow-countrymen. Lautrec was so weakened by these defections that he could not prevent the enemy from crossing the Adda,† and soon found himself compelled to retire on Milan with his discontented and discouraged army. In the capital itself everything was against the French, and late in the afternoon of the 19th of November, in the midst of pouring rain, the allied force appeared before the walls. The German landsknechte formed the vanguard, then followed the bulk of the Papal and Spanish troops, and last came the Swiss.

An immediate attack was resolved on, as news came from the city that the population was ready to rise against the French, and that the defences were inadequate.

\* GUICCIARDINI, XIV., 3.

† GUICCIARDINI, XIV., 3 ; GRUMELLO, 274. GIAN GIROLAMO ROSSI, *Vita di Giov. de' Medici*, in *Vita di uomini d'arme del sec.*, 16, Firenze, 1866, 88. \*The Marquis of Mantua wrote on the 16th of Nov. to Castiglione in Rome that he had the day before crossed the Adda with his troops, "sopra il ponte fatto sotto Rivolta." Gonzaga Archives, Mantua.

Cardinals Medici and Schinner, with Pescara and the Marquis of Mantua, pointed out certain suburbs as a good object for attack. Pescara, with Spanish marksmen, attacked the Porta Romana; Prospero Colonna, with Spaniards and German mercenaries, attacked the Porta Ticinese. Contrary to all expectation, the suburbs were speedily occupied, and soon after the gates were forced. Lautrec had thought such a rapid approach of the enemy an impossibility, as the roads had, he considered, been made impassable by the rain. He was completely taken by surprise, and, without any serious attempt at resistance, retreated from Milan by the gate leading to Como; while the populace, to cries such as: Empire! Duke! Church! Palle! rose as one man and welcomed the enemy. In the night Maximilian Sforza was proclaimed Duke of Milan. Both victors and vanquished were equally surprised by the quick and easy conquest of the capital of Lombardy.\*

The fate of Milan decided that of the whole of Lombardy. Piacenza, Pavia, Novara, Tortona, Alessandria, Asti, Cremona, and Lodi willingly threw open their gates to the allies.† The French, it is true, succeeded in retaking

\* A full and authentic account of the conquest of Milan is given in SANUTO, XXXII., 162 *seq.*, 165, 168 *seq.*, 183 *seq.*, 188 *seq.*, in the printed reports of eye-witnesses, especially the report of Cardinal Medici and that of the Marquis of Mantua. See also BURIGOZZO in Arch. stor. Ital., 1st Series, III., 433; CAPELLA, 28 *seq.* Many, among them Francis I., attributed the conquest of Milan to Schinner; see Eidgenöss. Abschiede, IV., 1, 139.

† On Nov. 24 the Marquis of Mantua, "ex felicibus castris in Mediolano," wrote to B. Castiglione: \*Ultra Piasenza e Pavia si sono rese ancor Novara, Tortona, Alexandria et Asti et si manda uno trombetta ad dimandar Lodi. On the 26th he wrote to announce the capitulation of Cremona. Copies of both \*letters in the Library of Mantua.

Cremona, but had at the same time to evacuate Parma, and they also lost Como. Altogether the star of France seemed to be on the wane. On the 24th of November the English Chancellor concluded a defensive and offensive alliance with the Pope and Emperor against Francis I.\* The prudent Venetians meditated a breach of their alliance with France, on the plea that quite unexpected events had completely altered the situation.

For three months Leo X. had watched the progress of the war in Northern Italy with indescribable excitement. The pause when the war had scarcely been begun, then the raising of the siege of Parma, had put him into despair.† We can learn from the famous letters of Baldassare Castiglione how anxiously the Pope awaited news of the progress of the war, and how he despaired one day and hoped the next.‡ His Holiness, Castiglione reports on the 15th of October, 1521, is filled with great anxiety; were it possible, he would like to know every hour how things are going in Lombardy.§ When better news arrived on the 17th of October, Leo, with arms upraised, prayed to God that it might be true. His joy was all the

\* HERBERT, Henry VIII., London, 1649, 117 *seq.*; BROSCHE, VI., 152.

† *Cf. supra*, 51, and SANUTO, XXII., 24; two \*\*Letters of Castiglione of Sept. 15, 1521. Gonzaga Archives, Mantua.

‡ Castiglione reports on Sept. 28, 1521: \*Sua S<sup>ta</sup> sta con bona speranza de victoria e ridese de la voce che spargono questi Francesi con dire che se tratta l'accordo et a me pare cognoscere che S. S<sup>ta</sup> non gli sia punto inclinata. In a \*Letter of Castiglione's to the Marquis on Oct. 7, it says: \*El Papa sta in grandissima espettatione de vedere el fine, el quale N. S. Dio conceda secondo che S. S<sup>ta</sup> desidera. On October 10 he says in another letter: \*N. S. desidera summamente de intendere nove delli eserciti. Gonzaga Archives, Mantua.

§ \*S. S<sup>ta</sup> per essere le cose in tal termine e cosi strette come sono sta molto suspeso con molta anxietà de animo e se possibil fosse vorrebbe ogni hor sapere ciò che si fa. Gonzaga Archives, Mantua.



greater because this was the first time that Cardinal Medici had sent favourable tidings. "The state of expectancy which reigns here has reached its highest point," wrote Castiglione; "never before have such various rumours floated about Rome."\* But all the time Leo was tormented by the fear that Francesco Maria della Rovere would try to regain possession of Urbino.†

To the Pope the position was all the more critical because he had to bear nearly all the expense of the war;‡ for Charles was heavily burdened by the expense incident on the insurrection of the Spanish towns, and the maintenance of his army in the Netherlands, and was able to send money to Italy only at uncertain intervals. But it was not only his financial difficulties which exercised the Pope.§ The vacillations of the Swiss, on whom the final settlement of the war seemed to depend, caused him acute anxiety. There were times when Leo, though quite in the secret of his heart, began to give ear to the suggestions of the French.|| But these were only passing fits of weakness such as cannot cause surprise in one of his timid nature. When he faced the actual state of affairs he knew very well that he must stand firm. In order to cut from under his feet the possibility of any change of purpose, and to remove from the Imperialists

\* \*\*Castiglione to the Marquis, dat. from Rome, Oct. 17, 1521. Gonzaga Archives, Mantua.

† Cf. BALAN, Boschetti, I., 148-149.

‡ VETTORI, 336.

§ Attempts to procure money were made in a variety of ways, especially by the creation of new offices and invention of new taxes; cf. SANUTO, XXXII., 24, 44, 89, 116, 149. On Oct. 23, 1521, Castiglione reports as follows to his Marquis: \*Il Papa fa provisione di denari gagliardamente. Cardinali farannosi a questo Natale, ma non in tanta quantita come forsi altri estima. Gonzaga Archives, Mantua.

|| GUICCIARDINI (XIV. 3) says this explicitly.

all excuse for doubting his steadfastness, he sent Cardinal Medici as Legate to the army in the last week of September. Medici was very unwilling to leave Rome, and hesitated for some time to obey,\* though the Pope wrote to him with his own hand commanding him to undertake the work.† The appointment of this man, who, although he often resided in Florence, was nevertheless called into consultation on all important occasions, meant as much as if the Pope himself had been present with the army.‡

Leo X., who had been seriously ill in the last week of August, but had now recovered as quickly,§ was again taken ill in the night between the 25th and 26th of October. This time it was not owing to a chill or to his old fistula trouble, but to his chronic state of excitement.|| However, by the 5th of November he was again convalescent;¶ and on the 15th he held a Consistory. At this, for a consideration of 10,000 ducats, he gave the Duke Giovanni Maria da Varano of Camerino the title of Admiral of the Papal fleet.\*\* Next day, contrary to precedent, the Pope was present at the obsequies of a Cardinal; he wished to prove that he had quite recovered his health. After this he went

\* VETTORI, 336.

† \*Il card. de Medici verà in campo benchè mal voluntieri. Il Papa li ha scritto una lettera di man propria efficacissima. \*Castiglione to the Marquis of Mantua, Rome, Sept. 26, 1521. Gonzaga Archives, Mantua.

‡ GUICCIARDINI, XIV., 3.

§ See Paris de Grassis in HOFFMANN, 475.

|| Cf., with SANUTO, XXXII., 89, the detailed \*\*Reports of B. Castiglione to the Marquis of Mantua, dat. Rome, Oct. 26, 27, and 28, 1521 (Gonzaga Archives, Mantua), and PARIS DE GRASSIS, \*Diarium (Secret Archives of the Vatican).

¶ SANUTO, XXXII., 116.

\*\* See \*Acta Consist. (Consistorial Archives of the Vatican). Cf. SANUTO, XXXII., 187.

to his hunting villa at Magliana.\* Ambassadors who had any news to communicate, visited him there in numbers, and were received without ceremony. On the 23rd of November Castiglione, the Ambassador of the Marquis of Mantua, had a long conversation with him at Magliana, about the events of the war and the chances of taking Milan.†

On the afternoon of the 24th of November the secretary of Cardinal Medici arrived in Rome with the intelligence that the capital of Lombardy had been taken.‡ He at once went on to Magliana, accompanied by Giberti. They found the Pope saying Lauds, having just reached the passage in the Benedictus: "that being delivered from the hand of our enemies, we may serve him without fear" (Luke i. 74). Leo's joy at the news brought was intense, although he realized that the war was as yet only half over. He had all the details related to him, and put many questions as to the condition of the army, the position of the French, Cardinal Medici's state of health, and the dispositions of the Milanese. Messenger after messenger

\* SANUTO, XXXII., 149.

† See Castiglione's letter of Nov. 23, 1521 (Gonzaga Archives Mantua), printed in the rare *Nozzeschrift* Lettere dipl. del conte B. Castiglione, Padova, 1875.

‡ For the last days of Leo X., described by many writers with the most arbitrary misstatements (ROSCOE-HENKE, III., 477), *cf.* especially the trustworthy and detailed account of Bart. Angelelli on Dec. 3, 1521, and that of G. Bonfiglio of Dec. 5, in SANUTO, XXXII., 239 *seq.* and 233; *cf.* 187 (where there is apparently a fault in the date) and 203-204, extracts from Gradenigo's letters; Castiglione's letters in BASCHET, Cath. de Médicis, 266-267; *cf.* BERGENROTH, II., n. 365, 366; BREWER, III., 2, n. 1824, 1825; Paris de Grassis in RAYNALDUS, 1521, n. 109, and HOFFMANN, 475-477; ALBÈRI, II., 3, 71; VETTORI, 338 (with wrong date); \*Letter of Ang. Germanello, dat. Rome, 1521, Dec. 2 (Gonzaga Archives, Mantua); \*Letter of Stefano Saffa (detto l'Eremita), dat. Rome, 1521, Dec. 1 (State Archives, Modena).

was despatched to Rome with orders to celebrate the event in a fitting manner. Cannon from St. Angelo proclaimed the victory to the inhabitants of the Eternal City; the joy caused by the news was altogether indescribable.\*

At Magliana those in the immediate entourage of the Pope were intoxicated with joy, especially the Swiss, who looked on the capture of Milan as an avenging of Marignano. Fireworks were sent off throughout the night, to the accompaniment of music and volleys of guns. This commotion, added to his excitement, kept the Pope awake all night. It was reported that he passed it sitting at the open window, sunk in thought, and watching the doings of the Swiss, till he became so chilled that he had to return to the stove to warm. By this imprudence he caught a severe chill, and symptoms of fever soon set in. In the afternoon of the 25th of November the Pope returned to Rome. It was one of those glorious winter days such as are perhaps known only in Rome, with the sun shining with almost too much warmth; in spite of this the Pope shivered and walked part of the distance on foot; this did not improve matters, for, owing to his corpulence, he broke into a profuse perspiration. However, he paid scarcely any attention to this, so occupied was he by the thought of the great reception which was awaiting him in Rome, which was to remind him of the ovation at the beginning of his Pontificate, when he took possession of the Lateran. The crowds greeted him with joy, and the Cardinals received him with reverence. Everywhere the air echoed with joyous cries and salvos of cannon. He beamed with joy, and said to the Imperial Ambassador that he rejoiced more over the conquest of Milan than he had rejoiced at his election to the Papal

\* Cf. Castiglione's letter of Nov. 24, 1521, in the writing about the *Esenzioni*, 28-29, quoted *supra*, p. 45, n.



chair.\* These words show with a terrible clearness how far the secularization of the supreme dignity of the Church had advanced since it was commenced by Sixtus IV.†

Leo X. talked with his Master of Ceremonies about the arrangements for a solemn service of thanksgiving for the victory. Paris de Grassis remarked in his dry way that public thanksgivings should not be offered up for a victory gained over a Christian power, unless there had been at stake some special advantage for the Church. Full of glee, the Pope replied, smiling, that the greatest advantage for the Church was at stake, and that on Wednesday he would make all arrangements in a Consistory.‡ Rome held high festival till late into the night. As was their way, the Romans indulged in the wildest of surmises, and many believed, without a shadow of proof, that the Duchy of Milan was destined for Cardinal Medici.§

In the evening the Pope dined in the best of spirits, and that night slept well. But next morning (November 26), while he was giving audience to Cardinal Trivulzio and

\* Manuel, Nov. 27, in BERGENROTH, II., n. 364.

† How much this was felt by contemporaries is shown in several passages by the Sienese chronicler TIZIO. In 1521 he writes thus: \*Et profecto mirum est cur pontifices Christianorum, qui pace studere deberent et nulli parti regum dissidentium adherere, assensum praebeant atque procurent Christiani cruoris tantum effundi in dies ac virginum multitudinem lupanari infamia pollui prophanari edes sacras ac virginum vestalium fedari monasteria, sacra vasa sacramve suppellectilem diripi sine ullo dei aliusve ultoris metu, clerum et pia loca in dies gravibus pecuniar. decimationibus onerari et anghariari. Cod. G, II., 39, f. 41, of the Chigi Library, Rome.

‡ Paris de Grassis in RAYNALDUS, 1521, n. 109.

§ Paris de Grassis in HOFFMANN, 475. Cf. DE LEVA, II., 115, who remarks further: Mancano di ciò le prove.

one of his relatives, he was taken with a shivering fit and had to break off the interview and return to bed. Though restless in the night, he felt fairly well on Wednesday the 27th, though rather weak, so that the Consistory was postponed. The physicians declared that his ailment was a case of simple intermittent fever, the consequence of the chill he had caught in the night at Magliana. Towards evening and during the following days they gave the usual remedies for cold and intermittent fever, and had no doubt that the Pope would be quite well in a few days. But in the evening of the 29th of November he had such a severe fainting fit that the doctors became alarmed. Already arrangements were being made in several quarters for the possibility of a vacancy in the Holy See.\* Nor did the Pope conceal from himself the gravity of his state, and made a general confession with great devotion.† However, on Saturday he again felt so well that he sent off some Briefs and enjoyed some music. He went so far as to declare that in eight days, on the Feast of St. Ambrose, he wished to visit the church of that saint, and also S. Maria del Popolo. But in the evening violent fever suddenly returned and he lost consciousness for a time; those about him were much alarmed,‡ and three messengers were sent to Cardinal Medici.

\* See Giberti's letter of Nov. 30, 1521, in BALAN, Boschetti, I., 177 *seq.*

† S. S<sup>ta</sup> se avea confessato il Venere quando ebbe il primo accidente. Report of G. Bonfiglio in SANUTO, XXXII., 233; *cf.* 235, 243. The Swiss captain, Kaspar Röist, also testifies to this in his letter of Dec. 4 (Eidgenöss. Abschiede, IV., 1, 153). See also Castiglione's letter of Dec. 2 in BASCHET, Catherine de Médecis, 267. GREGOROVIVS (VIII., 265) is mistaken in gathering from this letter that the Pope also received Communion.

‡ *Cf.* the \*Letter of Floriano Montino, dated from Rome, Nov. 30, 1521. State Archives, Modena.

In the night he was very ill, and in the morning of the 1st of December he complained of great interior heat, and it was with difficulty that he allowed himself to be persuaded to take some nourishment. Then once again he was better and the fever left him. He was in great spirits and talked a great deal, and the doctors again entertained hopes of a speedy recovery. He had already heard of the conquest of Piacenza, and now on this day he learned that Parma had been taken. To win back these two cities had been his chief motive for beginning the war; and he had declared at the time to Cardinal Medici that he would gladly purchase their recovery with his life.\* It seemed now that his hope of securing the independence of the Holy See, by an increase of the States of the Church, was about to be realized.†

The improvement in the Pope's condition continued all day. Feeling quite easy about him, the few persons who had been admitted to the sick-room went away. These were the doctor, Cardinal Pucci, Bishop Ponzetti, the Pope's two nephews Salviati and Ridolfi, and his sister Lucrezia, wife of Jacopo Salviati. However, at eleven o'clock a more violent shivering fit than any before seized on him. Leo X. knew that his hour had come, and at once asked for Extreme Unction. Viaticum was deferred, presumably because of his extreme weakness.‡ He repeatedly kissed the crucifix, and called on the name of Jesus: it was his last word. When Cardinal Pucci, who had been summoned in haste,

\* GUICCIARDINI, XIV., 4.

† NITTI, 456.

‡ B. Angelelli says explicitly: "S. S<sup>ta</sup> cognoscendo el morire adomandò l'oglio santo"; SANUTO, XXXII., 242. The contrary statement in ROSCOE-HENKE, III., 477, RANKE, I.<sup>8</sup>, 58, and BROSCHE, I., 62, that Leo X. died without the last sacraments, is therefore absolutely false.

entered the room, he found the Pope unconscious.\* He died at midnight.†

Early in the morning of the 2nd of December the totally unexpected news of the death of the Supreme Pontiff was spread throughout the city, where all the shops were shut. The consternation of the friends and adherents of the Medici Pope was very great. Their glory had departed: and even in the night they carried off from the Vatican everything that they could lay hands on.‡ In the morning the Cardinals could be seen hurrying to the Vatican for a preliminary consultation. The Palace was closed, and the Swiss mounted fifty pieces of ordnance on it, while everywhere men armed themselves. Everything, however, remained quiet, so good

\* The oft-repeated assertion of a popular preacher in 1537, that Fra Mariano alone remained by the Pope's death-bed (see TIRABOSCHI, VII., 3, 380), is not confirmed by the version we have seen of B. Angelelli's detailed and well-founded contemporary report. On the other hand we find the information, "Frate Mariano buffone li raccomandava l'anima per quanto si dice," in a letter sent from Rome on Dec. 21, 1521; SANUTO, XXXII., 289. But this anonymous letter contains the most malicious exaggerations (see REUMONT, III., 2, 123), and also direct untruths, *e.g.* that the Pope had died without confession. Cf. also ROSSI, Pasquinate, XI.

† There was a post-mortem examination of the body next day (see the report drawn up from the statements of Paris de Grassis in HOFFMAN, 479 *seq.*, which are not in this case very sufficient, and LAEMMER, Mantissa, 200-201; cf. B. Castiglione in NITTI, 455). The body was laid out in Cardinal Medici's rooms, and afterwards removed to St. Peter's (SANUTO, XXXII., 242), and there interred in the evening; cf. FABRONIUS, 239.

‡ According to Gradenigo (ALBÈRI, *loc. cit.*, 71) Leo's sister Lucrezia took part in the pillage. An authentic proof that many things were stolen from the Vatican in the night before Leo's death is found in some \*marginal notes to the \*Inventarium omnium bonorum existentium in foraria S. D. Leonis X., f. 8 and f. 8b. State Archives, Rome.



were the precautionary measures taken by the Sacred College.\*

The sudden death of this Pope, at the early age of forty-six, at the very moment when messenger after messenger was arriving with news of fresh victories, has something tragic about it. "Just eight days ago," wrote Castiglione of the 2nd of December, "His Holiness returned from Magliana in triumphal procession, such as had not been seen since the first days of his Pontificate. This evening there will take place a very different kind of solemnity, his interment in St. Peter's. Thus changeable is human fortune! The Lord God overthrows our plans as He pleases."†

It may be said that the proverbial good-fortune of Leo X. accompanied him to his death; for had he lived, he would have had to carry on the war with an exhausted exchequer and under the greatest difficulties. He knew only of the triumph of his arms, what was to follow was hidden from him.‡

As in all cases of sudden death, there was much talk of

\* Cf. the lucid reports in SANUTO, XXXII., 237 *seq.*, 242, and the letter of Kaspar Röist in Eidgenöss. Abschiede, IV., 1, 153. See also BERGENROTH, II., n. 368, and the \*Letter of B. Castiglione, Dec. 3, 1521, in the Gonzaga Archives, Mantua.

† BASCHET, Catherine de Médecis, 266. Cf. also Giraldi in FABRONIUS, 317.

‡ SISMONDI, XIV., 536. It is well known that Wolsey attributed to the Pope the intention of using the power of the Hapsburg only to destroy that of the French; and that this being done, he meant to turn round on Charles so as to rid Italy of all foreign ascendancy. Guicciardini gathered the same thing from Cardinal Medici. NITTI also (457) does not consider that this idea should be quite rejected, but does right in putting it forward with the greatest caution, for the prudent Medici must have been aware that what might have been possible during the lifetime of Maximilian would be hopeless in face of such a power as that of Charles V.

poison connected with that of Leo X. The discoloration and swelling of the body after death were taken by many as a sure sign that his decease was the result of a crime.\* But the physician Severino, who had been present at the post-mortem examination, declared that there was no question of any such thing, though he admitted that he could not persuade his colleagues of it.† Suspicion fell at once on the Pope's cup-bearer, Bernabò Malaspina, who belonged to the French party; his behaviour excited suspicion, and he was arrested. However, his examination brought nothing to light on which his accusers could lay hands; Cardinal Medici had him set at liberty, presumably so as not to make an irreconcilable enemy of Francis I., should he be found to be mixed up in the case.‡ Both Francesco Maria della Rovere and the Duke of Ferrara were mentioned as instigators of the crime. The latter gave an excuse for this suspicion by the scandalous signs of joy in which he indulged when he heard of his enemy's decease. He rewarded with generosity those who brought the news, and vilified the memory of the dead Pontiff in every possible way.§

\* Paris de Grassis in RAYNALDUS, 1521, n. 109; SANUTO, XXXII., 217, 234, 235 *seq.*; Reports of the Mayence Ambassador in KRAFFT, *Briefe und Dokumente aus der Zeit der Reformation*, Elberfeld, 1875, 31, 32, 24, and letters of Castiglione in RENIER, *Notizia*, 19 *seqq.*, and MARTINATI, 40 *seqq.*

† See Bonfiglio's report, SANUTO, XXXII., 234, and Paris de Grassis, *loc. cit.*

‡ SANUTO, XXXII., 234, 238; Campeggio in BREWER, III., n. 2, 1869; JOVIUS, *Vita Leonis X.*, lib. 4; GUICCIARDINI, XIV., 4; Paris de Grassis, *loc. cit.*; \*Blasii de Martinelles de Cesena, *Diarium* (Ceremonial Archives of the Vatican).

§ Cf. JOVIUS, *Vita Alphonsi*; FRIZZI, *Mem. di Ferrara*, IV., 286; ARIOSTO, *Lettere* ed. Cappelli, 3rd ed., Milano, 1887, LXXXII. BALAN, *seqq.*; VI., 55-56.

Francesco Vettori, the great friend of the Medici, has declared himself, in his *History of Italy*, adverse to the idea of poison. In a letter to the Englishman, Clerk,\* he attributes the Pope's death entirely to the chill he caught in the night at Magliana; and says that anyone who knew Leo's constitution, his corpulency, his bloated countenance, and almost chronic catarrh, as well as his manner of living, with frequent fasts and heavy meals, would be surprised that he had lived so long.†

Two of the most celebrated contemporary historians, Guicciardini and Giovio, are firmly convinced that he was poisoned,‡ as is also Baldassare Castiglione.§ Nevertheless, the result of the post-mortem, as far as it is known, as well as the form taken by the Pope's illness of intermittent fever with intervals of complete convalescence, offered no sanction for the idea of death by

\* Clerk to Wolsey, Dec. 2, BREWER, III., 2, n 1825.

† VETTORI, 338. H. Borgia also mentions the peculiarity of his dietary in his report, which is in other respects incredibly embellished in BROSCH, *Kirchenstaat*, I., 62, n. 1. Manuel speaks of this in his letter of Dec. 2 (BERGENROTH, II., n. 366), with a cautious hint about poison.

‡ JOVIUS, *Vita Leonis X.*, lib. 4; GUICCIARDINI, XIV., 4. The suspicion of poison is definitely indicated by these; and K. Röist, in the report above quoted, says that there was a suspicion of poisoned wine having been given. The same is said in LANCELLOTTI, I., 210: "El si dice." The statement of GORI is similar (*Archivio*, IV., 245). See also ROSSI, *Pasquinate*, IX. Among modern historians GREGOROVIVS (VIII., 264) has expressed himself most strongly against the theory of poison, but without any clear reasons for the doubt. NITTI (455) says truly that to all appearances the illness was that of "febbre perniciosa," yet there seemed some foundation for the suspicion of poison. In April, 1519, Venice had reported that a certain scoundrel had wished to poison the Pope and his relatives; see LAMANSKY, *Secrets de Venise*, 406-407.

§ RENIER, *Notizia*, 19-20.



violence. Everything points rather to the idea that Leo X., like Alexander VI., was the victim of a virulent attack of malaria.\*

The number of enemies possessed by Leo was revealed by the extravagant attacks which were showered on his memory after his death. Verses of bitterest scorn and senseless rage poured in. The favourites of the Medici, whose hopes were now destroyed, were ridiculed by satirical pictures and medals with biting inscriptions.† Every manner of accusation was levelled against the late Pope. This immoderate abuse was only equalled by the immoderate flattery which had been showered on him when newly elected.‡ In other ways also his end was in striking contrast with the brilliant beginning of his Pontificate. In consequence of the financial need his funeral obsequies, though not as mean as had been some, were by no means brilliant.§ His funeral oration, delivered by Antonio da Spello, was very short. There could have been nothing

\* As at the present day, this infectious malaria raged at that time in the neighbourhood of Magliana; see JOVIUS, *Vita*, lib. 4. Cases of malaria are prevalent in a damp, warm winter, especially when added to imprudence like that of Leo X. in the night of November 25.

† SANUTO, XXXII., 288, 289-290.

‡ Some of these pasquinades in SANUTO, XXXII., 289, 302, 356 (the one there quoted, "Intravit ut vulpes, vixit ut leo, mortuus est ut canis," had already been applied to Boniface VIII., see *Giorn. d. lett. Ital.*, XXXI., 401), others in TIZIO, \**Hist. Senen. Cod. G*, II., 39, f. 66b *seqq.* (Chigi Library, Rome), and elsewhere; *cf.* ROSSI, *Pasquinate*, XII. *seqq.*, 78; *Nuova Antologia*, 3rd Series, XXXVIII., 682, LI., 535 *seqq.*; *Giorn. d. lett. Ital.*, XXVIII., 58 *seqq.*, 88 *seqq.*; GNOLI, *Secolo*, III., 48 *seqq.*; CESAREO, 195, 207 *seqq.* Many unprinted, esp. in *Cod. Ottob.*, 2817, Vatican Library. Alongside of these there are not wanting praises of the dead; see ROSCOE-BOSSI, XII., 47, n. 2.

§ See Paris de Grassis in HOFFMANN, 481 *seqq.* (*cf.* DELICATI-ARMELLINI, 89). SANUTO, XXXII., 260-271, 274.



noteworthy in it, or it would not have passed without mention.\* The Pope of the Renaissance, so devoted to magnificence, was buried very poorly; a simple tomb in St. Peter's covered his mortal remains.† It was only in the Pontificate of Paul III. that a great tomb in white marble was erected for him in the choir behind the high altar at S. Maria sopra Minerva. Its execution was given to the Florentine, Baccio Bandinelli,‡ and the work of designing it entrusted to Antonio di Sangallo.§ Four Corinthian columns support an arch surmounted by the Medici arms and subjects in relief; that in the middle depicts the meeting of Leo X. with Francis I. at Bologna; in the principal niche sits the Medici Pope, holding the keys in his left hand, while he raises the right in blessing. The figures of the Princes of the Apostles,|| by Baccio Bandinelli, the

\* Paris de Grassis (\*Diarium) says it is true: \*Ipse sermo fuit brevis, compendiosus et accommodatus. On the other hand, SANUTO remarks (XXXII., 290) that the discourse was "assai brutta et da piovan da villa." The numerous commemorative discourses delivered at the Universities are preserved; see ROSCOE-BOSSI, XII., 48-49.

† JOVIUS, Vita, lib. 4.

‡ Cf. the contract of 1536 in Arch. stor. dell' Arte, V., 2, 305. Vasari (in the Life of Alf. Lombardi) relates that when Clement VII. died, Cardinal Ippolito de' Medici commissioned that sculptor to prepare the tombs of both Medici Popes. Lombardi prepared them from drawings by Michael Angelo, and went to Carrara to choose the marble. When Cardinal Ippolito died, Lombardi was dismissed by Cardinals Salviati, Ridolfi, Pucci, Cibo, and Gaddi, and, at the request of Leo's sister, Lucrezia Salviati, the execution of the monument was handed over to Baccio Bandinelli, who had prepared a sketch of it during the lifetime of Clement VII. There is a sketch of the tomb in CIACONIUS, III., 331, and CLAUSSE, San Gallo, II., 317, who, however, changed the two tombs of Leo X. and Clement VII.

§ CLAUSSE, *loc. cit.*, II., 316.

|| Not virtues, as they are called by LÜBKE, *Gesch. der Plastik* (2nd ed., 1871), 734 *seqq.*

needy rival of Michael Angelo, which stand in the two side niches, are quite as commonplace as the central figure of the Pope executed by Raffaello da Montelupo. The whole thing is a cold and insipid piece of work, unworthy of the patron of Raphael. As is most unusual, there is no inscription on the tomb.\* Yet never was there a Pope who was the subject of more inscriptions in his lifetime than Leo X.

\* MASETTI (Mem. della chiesa di S. Maria sopra Minerva, Roma, 1855, 19) surmises that the inscription may be covered by the stalls. There is no foundation for this idea. The translation of Leo's bones, together with those of Clement VII., from St. Peter's to S. Maria sopra Minerva, took place, according to MORONI, XII., 143, on the 6th of June, 1542.

## CHAPTER III.

### PERSONALITY AND MANNER OF LIFE OF LEO X.

#### —HIS FINANCES AND COURT.

THE outward appearance of the Pope who gave his name to the age of the Renaissance, with its worship of the beautiful, was far from attractive in itself. Leo X. was of more than middle height, broad-shouldered and very fat, though, as Giovio declares,\* he was rather bloated than actually stout. His unusually large head and full face, set on a short neck, were out of proportion with the rest of his body. His legs were in themselves well shaped, but too short for the frame they supported. The only beautiful things about him were his well-cared-for and snow-white hands, which he took pleasure in adorning with costly rings. The want of charm of his flabby, fat face was increased by his weak and prominent eyes, and their unusually short sight, which was an inherited

\* JOVIUS, *Vita Leonis X.*, lib. 4. In what follows *cf.* the anonymous *Vita Leonis X.*, in the *Cod. Vatic.*, 3920, printed in ROSCOE-HENKE, III., 618 *seq.*, and ROSCOE-BOSSI, XII., 153 *seqq.*; *cf.* the same (177 *seqq.*) about the value of this very impartial biographical sketch written soon after the death of Leo X. In the printing some passages unfavourable to Leo X. have been omitted; see JANUS, 381. Finally, *cf.* Gradenigo's narrative in ALBÈRI, 2nd Series, III., 72, and Bonivard in MONNIER (*Literaturgesch. der Renaissance*, Nördlingen, 1888, 356 *seq.*). See CIAN in the *Giorn. stor. d. lett. Ital.*, XLVIII., 419 *seq.* See also DELABORDE, M. A. Raimondi, 59.

family defect.\* This, in spite of his efforts to dispense with it, compelled him to make frequent use of a magnifying glass.† A drawing in the possession of the Duke of Devonshire, attributed to Sebastiano del Piombo, reproduces the coarse features of Leo X. with lifelike faithfulness.‡

The unpleasant impression at first produced by his exterior almost entirely disappeared after further intercourse. The Pope's musical and pleasant voice, his intelligent way of expressing himself, and his manner, which, for all its majesty, was friendly and full of charm, his lively interest in science and art, and his unaffected delight with the creations laid at his feet by the highly-cultivated men of the age, could not fail to captivate all who came in contact with him. Raphael has reproduced this side of his character in his famous portrait of his patron in the Pitti Gallery.§ This wonderful portrait, in spite of

\* See ARIOSTO, *Lettere* ed. Cappelli, 3rd ed., Milano, 1887, 23; and the facetious remarks of Equicola, LUZIO-RENIER, Mantova, 210.

† See BURCKHARDT, I.<sup>7</sup> 344, and the literature therein quoted.

‡ Cf. STRONG, *Reproductions of Drawings by Old Masters in the Collection of the Duke of Devonshire at Chatsworth, London, 1904.*

§ A fresh and excellent copy of this by Andrea del Sarto is in the Museum at Naples. A copy by Bugiardini is in the Corsini Gallery in Rome. Cf. A. NICCOLINI, *Sul ritratto di Leone X., dipinto da Raffaello e sulla copia di A. del Sarto*, Napoli, 1841; (R. BETTI) *Sul ritratto di Leone X., etc.*, Napoli, 1842; C. PANCALDI, *Sulla vertenza intorno al ritratto di Leone X.*, Milano, 1842; G. MASSELLI, *Sul ritratto di Leone X., dipinto da Raffaello e sulla copia fatta da A. del Sarto*, Firenze, 1842; H. DE GARRIOD, *De la légitimité du portrait de Léon X., Réponse à A. Niccolini*, Florence, 1842; E. ROCCO, *Intorno al ritratto di Leone X.*, *s.l.*, 1842; C. GUERRA, *Sul Leone X., del R. Museo Borbonico*, Napoli, 1843; C. d'Arco ed. U. BRAGHIROLI in the *Arch. stor. Ital.*, 3rd Series, VII., 2, 175 *seq.*; REUMONT in the *Jahrb. für Kunstwiss.*, 1868, 211 *seq.*; SPRINGER, *Raphaël*, 114 *seq.*; GRUYER, *Raphaël peintre d. portraits*, 333 *seqq.*, 360 *seqq.*; STRZYGOWSKI, 47



its being embellished and ennobled,\* reproduces the originality and personality of the Pope far more correctly than does the above-mentioned sketch or the highly-realistic commemorative statue in the Capitol.†

Raphael has represented the Pope in his simple morning dress with the full red cape (*mozetta*), and the cap on his head which is known as the *camauro*. He is sitting at ease in an elbow-chair before a table, on the red damask cover of which there stands a richly-chased bell, with an open manuscript illuminated with miniatures. In his left hand,

*seq.* Against an unjust criticism of the picture, see *Kunstchronik*, 1899-1900, No. 22. Most later portraits are based on the one in the Pitti; see KENNER, 144. Other portraits are taken from the fresco of Attila (*cf.* CROWE, *Raffael*, II., 153), and the above-mentioned (p. 72) drawing by Sebastiano del Piombo, and the miniature from it in the collection of Prosper-Valton (reproduced in MÜNTZ, *Tapiss.*, 5), and the sketch of 1513 in the Hofmuseum in Vienna (3rd room, No. 460, 291). A beautiful marble bust, rather more than life size, made for Giannozzo Pandolfini, in the palace of that name, is not yet made public. Family tradition calls it the work of Michael Angelo, which is manifestly incorrect. Alfonso Lombardi's colossal marble statue of Leo X. (in which the Pope is represented as giving his blessing), in the Palazzo Vecchio, is a commonplace work. Still more may this be said of the bust in the same Palazzo in the Sala di Leone X. Caradosso and Sangallo designed medals of Leo X.; *cf.* ARMAND, I., 111, 159; II., 113, 114; III., 27, 31, 45, 46, 62, 143, 201-202. As to coins, see CINAGLI, *Monete de' papi*, Fermo, 1848; SCHULTE, I., 218 *seqq.* Fine cameos with the head of Leo X. are in the Uffizi at Florence (Nos. 500, 501, 3202, 3203); *cf.* WICKHOFF in *Kunstgeschichtl. Anzeigen*, 1906, S. 54.

\* GRIMM (*Leben Raphaels*, 439) declares that in this picture the painter of Urbino has "done more for his patron's memory than could have been done by the most brilliant historian. . . . It is the masterpiece of Raphael in this direction, and comes second to no historical portrait of any age. Vasari's praise was quite justified." Many, *e.g.* B. SCHUBLING, *Florenz* (Stuttgart, 1902), 132, place it above that of Julius II.

† *Cf.*, about this, *infra*, 283 *seqq.*, 352.

the intellectual friend of literature and art holds a magnifying glass, through which he has been examining the paintings, and seems anxious to have the opinion of Cardinals Medici and Rossi, who are standing beside him. By just these few touches—the glass, the illuminated book, and the beautiful bell—the Pope's characteristics as a lover of beauty and patron of art are placed on the canvas. The head, large out of proportion, the heavy expression, the flabby, beardless face, the furrowed forehead and the double-chin, are all truthfully reproduced.\* The expression of the countenance is pre-eminently that of gentleness and kindness, united to the quiet dignity of a self-conscious ruler and shrewd, calculating diplomatist. The expression of the persuasive mouth, round which there plays a smile, is inimitable, and illustrates to a marvellous degree what Giovio says about the refined and pleasant way of speaking peculiar to Leo X., and which could be quite as serious in important matters as it was full of a delightful ease, a gay humour, and the greatest courtesy imaginable in the ordinary affairs of life.†

Leo's cheerfulness of temper, which never failed him, even when suffering from his constitutional ailments, and especially the fistula trouble, is extolled by all contemporary writers;‡ though, added to his infirmities, it no

\* WÖLFFLIN, *Klass. Kunst.*, 116.

† JOVIUS, *Vita*, lib. 4; and the *Vita Anon.* in ROSCOE-HENKE, III., 619–620.

‡ As to Leo's generally weak health, and especially his fistula troubles, which brought on a severe illness in the summer of 1516, *cf.*, as well as the *Vita Anon.* in ROSCOE-HENKE, III., 619, SANUTO, XXII., 372, 412, 443, 456, 475; XXIII., 268; XXV., 204, 438, 611 *seqq.*; XXVI., 7, 51, 216; XXIX., 164 *seqq.*; *cf.* Vol. VII. of this work, p. 156, and *supra*, p. 58, and MARINI, I., 318 *seqq.* In the same (I., 303 *seqq.*) are valuable accounts of Leo's physicians and surgeons. The "Archangiolo" mentioned on p. 282 received eight ducats a month;

doubt increased the dilatoriness and slowness of action which were such characteristic features of the Medici Pope.\* The discomforts suffered by Leo, especially during long ecclesiastical functions, by reason of his corpulence, have been testified by his Master of Ceremonies, who describes how, on such occasions, he saw him keep wiping the perspiration from his face and hands.†

The observant Venetian Ambassador, Marino Giorgi, has drawn Leo's character most admirably with a few strokes of the pen. "The Pope," he says in his final report of March, 1517, "is a very good-tempered and generous man, who shrinks from severe exertion and desires peace. He would never be drawn into war unless entangled in it by his adherents. He loves the sciences and is well versed in

see \*SERAPICA, *Spese private di Leone X.*, I. (State Archives, Rome). See also *Mem. di ill. Pisani*, IV., 291 *seqq.*; HEIMBUCHER, I., 206. Among the physicians was the celebrated Jew, Bonet de Lattes, to whom Reuchlin turned (*cf.* MAULDE, *Juifs dans les États du St. Siege*, Paris, 1886, 17, and VOGELSTEIN, II., 35, 81, 83). It was not at all unusual to have Jews as physicians (*cf.* J. MÜNZ, *Ueber die jüdischen Aerzte, im Mittelalter*, Berlin, 1887; LANDAU, *Gesch. der jüdischen Aerzte*, Berlin, 1895). Even before his election Leo X. had a Jew (perhaps as a physician?) in his service. This man wished to settle in Ferrara, and Medici recommended him to Duke Alfonso of Ferrara: \*Cum Isac Hebreus de Phano in nos dum in minoribus essemus familiamque nostram plurima obsequia impenderit diuque fideliter inservierit. \*Brief dated from Rome, May 2, 1513 (State Archives, Modena). In Nos. 102 and 105 of the Borgo Nuovo in Rome we can still admire the beautiful palace of Leo's court physician, Giacomo di Bartolomeo da Brescia (*cf.* ADINOLFI, *Portica di San Pietro*, 109), the plan of which is ascribed to Raphael or Peruzzi. The inscription over it: Leonis X. Pont. Max. liberalitate || Jacobus Brixianus Chirugus || Aedificavit || no longer exists. About this physician who was attending Leo during the Conclave, *cf.*, besides MARINI, I., 317, the \*Ufficiali camerali, 1515-1521, f. 8, State Archives, Rome.

\* *Cf.* Paris de Grassis in HOFFMANN, 428, and GNOLI, *Cacce*, 15.

† Paris de Grassis in HOFFMANN, 416; *cf.* 420.



literature and canon law; but above all else he is an excellent musician.”\* “He is learned and the friend of literature,” is Marco Minio’s account, written some three years later; “he fulfils his religious duties conscientiously, but he will live and enjoy life. He takes especial pleasure in the chase.”†

Marino Giorgi’s narrative also contains the report of Leo having said to his brother Giuliano, soon after his election, “Let us enjoy the Papacy, since God has given it to us.” These words have been too readily repeated and accepted by authors who aspire after what is sensational; but they rest on no authentic tradition. The Ambassador who records them did not take up his post in Rome till two years after the election; therefore he is not a contemporary witness: furthermore, as a Venetian, he was by no means likely to speak impartially of Leo X. Evidently Giorgi is merely repeating an anecdote of the ante-chamber.‡ Other writers, who could speak with even less authority, give a different version of the words;§ on the other hand, Giovio and also Guicciardini scorn to take up or spread the reported words.|| However questionable it may be whether Leo X. ever did say those words, there is no doubt that they are descriptive of his desire for pleasure, and of the aspect in which he regarded his great position. Without suspecting the dangers which menaced the Papacy from

\* SANUTO, XXIV., 90, 93; ALBÈRI, 2nd Series, III., 51, 56.

† SANUTO, XXVIII., 517; ALBÈRI, *loc. cit.*, 64.

‡ Cf. MASI, Studi, I., 132, 158. Masi tries also to prove that the words as uttered with their original context have a different sense, and that by them Leo only wished to curb the covetous proclivities of his court.

§ Cf. PRATO, 405. According to J. Ziegler, Leo X. is made to say: “Nunc triumphabimus, amici.” RANKE, *Deutsche Gesch.*, VI., 132.

|| On the other hand, the author of the *Vita Anonyma* in Cod. Vatic., 3920, adopted them; see JANUS, 381.



within, he regarded himself only as the fortunate heir of the achievements of his powerful predecessor and as secure in his inheritance. He was zealously determined to maintain the strong position of the Holy See as he found it; but, for the rest, he gave himself without reserve to the intellectual enjoyments which the newly-opened world of the ancients, and the highly-developed culture of his own age, offered to him with such bountiful fulness.

The masterpieces of antiquity and the marvellous creations of contemporary artists interested him no less than did the thrilling accounts which reached him from the newly-discovered countries,\* the elegant discourses and poems of the humanists, the frivolous comedies of a Bibbiena or an Ariosto, the bewitching compositions of distinguished musicians, the witty sallies of his improvisatori and the coarse jests of the buffoons, who were at that time the welcome entertainment of almost every court. Everything unpleasant † was removed as far as possible from him, for an insatiable search for pleasure was a leading principle in his existence. This was a family characteristic, and with him it took shape from the surroundings in which he found himself.

Music and the drama, art and poetry, the intellectual, witty, and often coarse conversation of the courtiers, were enjoyed by the Pope with the unembarrassed light-heartedness of a spoilt child of the world. In all this he was a true son of that age of ferment, in which good and evil were mingled in the most extraordinary manner. His character

\* He used to read these records of an evening, *usque ad nauseam*, to his sister, PETRI MART., Epist., 562. The great interest taken by the Pope in a work entitled *Origine de' Turchi*, is related by A. Gabbioneta in his \*Report of Nov. 25, 1520. Gonzaga Archives, Mantua.

† We find in the ambassadorial reports such words as these: "Non vol fastidi." SANUTO, XXVI., 509.

reveals a peculiar combination of glorious and inglorious qualities, but what was light, gay, and infinitely versatile was far from being balanced by earnestness, depth, and originality. The rays of the Renaissance were focussed on him, and from them he borrowed glory, and by them irresistibly attracted to himself men of the most diverse nationalities and characters.\*

The range of the finer qualities of Leo X. is so evident that no one can doubt them. To these belong his high culture, his receptivity of all that was beautiful, his great gift of eloquence,† the ease and gracefulness of his epistolary style, Latin as well as Italian, his happy memory, his good judgment,‡ and, finally, the dignity, majesty, and piety which were conspicuous on all occasions in which he took part in the public worship of God.

That Leo X., in spite of the cheerful worldliness which seemed to be part of him, was conscientious in the fulfilment of all his religious duties—such as saying his Office, attending at divine worship, and observing the fasts—and that he manifested his piety on many occasions, is testified especially by his Master of Ceremonies,§ and

\* See GREGOROVIVS, VIII., 267 *seq.*; REUMONT, III., I, 142; WOLZOGEN, Raffael, 98; MASI, I., 135.

† Cf. Vol. VII. of this work, pp. 73 and 137; see also SANUTO, XV., 225, and Paris de Grassis in HOFFMANN, 450.

‡ With JOVIUS, Vita, cf. the Vita Anonyma, *loc. cit.*, and Matth. Herculanus in FABRONIUS, 205.

§ Cf. Paris de Grassis, 1513, March 24 (ROSCOE-HENKE, II., 62). About the Corpus Christi procession of 1513, Paris de Grassis reports as follows: \*Cumque alii dicerent ipsum cum mitra pretiosa ire oportere et non cum simplici propter solemnitatem actus et ego dicerem, me Iulium iussisse sine mitra retento solo bireto albo propter aerem matutinum, ipse hoc audito devote auscultans iussit ambas mitras auferri a se et etiam voluit per totam viam usque ad ultimum actus esse nudo capite, et sic fuit reverentissime, quod a multis fuit tamquam

also by others who by no means shrank from reporting things which were unfavourable to their master. Even the Venetian Ambassadors, who were but little inclined to be partial towards Leo, while often relating instances of his love of pleasure, are emphatic on the subject of his undoubted piety. It was this piety which led the busy Pope to hear Mass daily in the Chapel of S. Lorenzo, painted by Fra Angelico, and made him rigidly exact in reciting his daily office.\* Whenever the Pope said Mass, he went first to confession.† The reproach made against Leo X., that he took no interest in the more serious sciences, especially in theology, is as unfounded as the accusation that he gave

devotissimus commendatus, licet nonnulli damnaverint non decere pontificem esse nudo capite, ad quos ego respondi immo decere portans sacramentum non procedens suis pedibus prout est sic faciendum. On Dec. 19, 1513, after the sitting of the Council (*cf.* DELICATI-ARMELLINI, 10): \*Quia pluviae instabant papa recta recessit ad aedes suas omissa basilica. Notavi autem devotionem eius qui cum scalas sanctas, quae Pilati vulgo dicuntur et a mulieribus non nisi genuflexis ascenduntur, non nisi discoperto capite ac semper orando ascendit et in summo quasi veniam a Deo petiit quod non genuflexus ascenderit. Haec dixi quia non possem eius in omnibus et universis actionibus pietatem referre, sed haec alibi. About the Corpus Christi procession in 1516: \*Papa semper fuit nudo capite licet a me pluries incitatus, ut, si non mitram saltem birretum assumeret propter sanitatem, sed non voluit. On the vigil of the Epiphany, 1519: In spite of "frigus intensum" the Pope took part in the divine worship. \*Diarium (Secret Archives of the Vatican and Rossiana Library in Vienna). *Cf.* Vol. VII. of this work, pp. 34 and 233, and HOFFMANN, 443. See also SANUTO, XXVII., 297. Leo X. was more severe with his fasts than is commanded by the Church; see *infra*, p. 143.

\* *Cf.* ALBÈRI, 2nd Series, III., 64; SANUTO, XXIX., 164, 474, and *supra*, p. 59. On August 15, 1517, PARIS DE GRASSIS mentions the capella parva superior, in qua papa quotidie parvam missam audit quaeque dicata est S. Laurentio et Stephano. \*Diarium (Secret Archives of the Vatican).

† SANUTO, XXIII., 395.



utterance to infidel and free-thinking opinions.\* Leo X. was but too often very worldly, but most certainly he was no unbeliever, even though he was not a man of deep interior religion. If he was not so ready as most of his contemporaries to consider extraordinary occurrences as miraculous, in the strict sense of the term, such sobriety of judgment on his part is only worthy of commendation.†

As to the purity of the morals of Leo X., it can only be said that as a Cardinal his reputation in this respect was

\* The words "Quantum nobis nostrisque ea de Christo fabula profuerit, satis est omnibus saeculis notum," which Leo is reported to have said in connection with Bembo, were attributed to him in a violent satire by an apostate Carmelite in the time of Queen Elizabeth (J. BALE, *Pageant of Popes*, 179, ed. 1574). Although the satire is full of the most senseless statements (such as that Bembo was made Cardinal, and that Giuliano and Lorenzo de' Medici were bastard sons of the Pope, etc.), this anecdote has been accepted by many writers on the mere word of this anti-Papal partisan who was not even a contemporary. BAYLE (*Dict. art.*, Léon X.) expresses his surprise at this, and, like ROSCOE-BOSSI, XII., 83-84, rejects the utterance as totally unworthy of belief. The \**Diarium of the Master of Ceremonies*, Paris de Grassis, retails many of Leo's confidential utterances, but not one which savours of infidelity. Moreover, in the thousands of ambassadorial reports in the Archives of Mantua, Modena, and Florence, which the Marchese Ferrajoli and I looked through between us, there is not the slightest trace of anything said by Leo X. which could be interpreted in an infidel sense. Nor are there any words from trustworthy sources of Luther (*cf.* WRAMPELMAYER, *Tagebuch Luthers*, 68) or other enemies of the Papacy, even though their testimony in such a matter might be open to suspicion (such is the judgment of ROSCOE-BOSSI, XII., 85), which attribute any opinions to Leo contrary to the immortality of the soul. Even that most acrimonious critic of Leo X., D. GNOLI, says of the Medici Pope that he was not a *miscredente* (*Secolo di Leone X.*, II., 647). About J. Bale, *cf.* BELLESHEIM, *Geschichte der kat. Kirche in Irland*, II., 92, 98 *seq.*, Mainz, 1890.

† *Cf.* his sober opinion as against that of Paris de Grassis in the case of certain signa or prodigia; see RAYNALDUS, 1518, n. 1. *Cf.* DELICATI-ARMELLINI, 62, and *Not. des Ms. du Roi*, II., 598 *seq.*



absolutely spotless; there is no proof that as Pope\* he was in any way different.

One of the most pleasing aspects of the character of Leo X. is his great benevolence. There was scarcely a work of Christian charity to which he did not give his support. Monasteries and hospitals, not only in Rome but further afield, were the objects of his especial care.† Disabled soldiers, poor students, pilgrims, exiles, the blind, cripples and unfortunates of every description were

\* Whereas JOVIUS (Vita, lib. 4) passes over the whole subject of the truth of the accusations brought against the moral conduct of Leo X., and declares that the secrets of the private lives of princes are beyond the sphere of historians, GUICCIARDINI brings strong, though general, accusations against him, without, however, citing one witness. This passage, which has hitherto passed unnoticed, is, curiously enough, to be found in his History of Clement VII., lib. XVI. c., 5. However, Guicciardini is in this an untrustworthy witness. Apart from the fact that he was not at that time living in Rome, he contradicts himself in a most remarkable manner, especially in what concerns Leo X. Thus (XIV., 1), starting with the thoroughly wrong notion that Cardinal Medici conducted all business on his own account, and that Leo was quite passive (*alieno sopra modo dalle faccende*), the contrary of which is testified by all the Ambassadors (*infra*, p. 89), he soon after remarks most justly that much was attributed to Cardinal Medici which in reality emanated from the Pope. Matth. Herculanus (FABRONIUS, 296) praises chastity as one of Leo's principal virtues, and says explicitly that he preserved it as Pope. On the strength of this ROSCOE-HENKE (III., 510 *seq.*) and REUMONT (III., 2, 125) have rejected the whole of Guicciardini's accusation as without foundation. The reports of the Venetian and Mantuan Ambassadors contain nothing which could warrant the above-named accusations; even Ferrajoli, in an Este despatch, could find nothing beyond an insinuation which proved nothing. ROSCOE-HENKE (II., 55) have refuted the assertion that the Pope's fistula trouble was a consequence of his immoral life. It may be remarked that even GREGOROVIVS (VIII., 224) casts no doubt on the purity of Leo's life.

† JOVIUS, Vita, lib. 4. Cf. Regest. Leonis X., n. 2708, 3444, 3844 5176, 5503, 6565, 16,535; BEMBI, Epist., I., 24.

generously helped by him.\* No less than 6000 ducats were set aside annually to be spent on alms.† No wonder that, whenever the Pope went out, the poor from all quarters pressed round him to receive of his bounty.‡ These unfortunates often placed themselves in the corridor leading to the Belvedere;§ but it was especially when he made excursions into the country that the poor thronged his steps.|| He was as active in redeeming poor Christian slaves¶ as he was in maintaining those whom the Turks in their lust of conquest had driven from their homes. The books of accounts kept during his Pontificate are full of notes of his expenditure in cases of this kind. Among those who received regular pensions, we find alongside the entries of quite simple people many names of well-known and proudly titled persons. For instance, together with the members of the unfortunate

\* Numerous instances are given in the *\*Spese di Serapica*, I., II., III, State Archives, Rome.

† See *\*Divers. cam.*, LXIII. *seq.*, 126<sup>b</sup>, Secret Archives of the Vatican.

‡ On August 19, 1516, the Pope gave thirty ducats in alms on his way to S. Maria Maggiore. *\*Spese di Serapica*, I., State Archives, Rome.

§ On May 19, 1519, there is a note in the *\*Spese di Serapica*, II.: duc. 10 a una donna nel corridoro andando N. S. a Belvedere.

|| There are numerous instances in the *\*Spese di Serapica*. I take from Vol. II. the list of gifts on one single day in Corneto, Nov. 18, 1520: duc. 8 per amor di Dio a due povere donne in Corneto; duc. 2 a un povero homo, al qual fu rubato due sachi di mele; duc. 25 a una donna, che li fu bruciata la casa in Corneto; duc. 10 a un giovane di Corneto per andar a studiare; duc. 4 a le monache di S. Agostino; duc. 7 a septe pescatori; finally, a 21 donne povere un giulio per una, and an alms for Fra Nicolo di Padua. State Archives, Rome.

¶ Cf. *Regest Leonis*. X., n. 3471, 4559, 5056, 5261, 5500, 5585. See also *\*Spese di Serapica*, III., State Archives, Rome.

house of Aragon,\* we find a Catacuzeno, a Tocco di Arta, a Duke of Achaia and prince of Macedonia, and "two sons of the King of Cyprus." †

In his intercourse with others nothing could surpass Leo's tact and amiability. He knew how to adapt the tone of his voice, the expression of his countenance, and even his attitude to the circumstances of the interview. Even when compelled to refuse a request, which he disliked doing above all things, he knew how to soften the hardness of the blow by gentle excuses and by holding out a hope that some other opportunity of meeting might arise to efface any unfavourable impression. He was indeed always too apt to promise a great deal more than he could do; and one of his biographers attributes to this the revulsion of feeling against him which took place after his death. But whatever he had he gave away joyfully and freely, and he often said that he would gladly do more if it were in his power to do so. ‡

And yet this same man could be very hard, especially in political matters. As in other respects, so in this, the

\* \*Leo X. assignat Isabellae seniori relictæ Federici regis Siciliae et Isabellae iuniori et Iuliae de Aragonia pensiones, July 5, 1521. Cod. Barb., lat. 2428, f. 14, Vatican Library.

† See AMATI, 215, 217, 219, 220, 224, 225, 228, 229, 230, 233, 234, 235, 236. Cf. also Regest. Leonis X., n. 1990, 6216, 6505, 7409, 7417; SANUTO, XXVI., 510, and Rev. d. Bibl., V., 326 *seq.* About the "sons of the King of Cyprus," cf. REUMONT in the Suppl. to Allg. Ztg., 1879, No. 72, and CESAREO in the Nuova Rassegna, 1894, I., 1 *seqq.* Costantino Areneti Comnenus duca d'Achaia e principe di Macedonia was appointed Governor of Fano in 1516 by Leo X.; see \*Letter of Lorenzo de' Medici to the same, Nov. 5, 1516. Carte Stroz., IX., 188, State Archives, Florence.

‡ JOVIUS, lib. 4, Vita Anonyma, 619-620. \*Dare omnia cupit, negare nescit, a se tristem aliquem minimeque voti compotem discedere non facile patitur. RAPH. VOLATERR., Brevis historia in Cod. Vatic., 5875, f. 30, Vatican Library.

character of Leo seems to reveal simultaneously a dual personality; two souls dwelt within him. He was quite inexorable in his rejection of all intercession on behalf of Duke Francesco Maria della Rovere. He proceeded relentlessly against Giampaolo Baglioni and the tyrants of the Marches. Even Cardinal Petrucci had to pay for his crime with his life, though the Pope showed more forbearance towards the other Cardinals who were implicated in the plot. There is no doubt that under Julius II. these would not have come out of the affair with their lives.

Guicciardini's judgment on Leo X. as a politician is that he showed less good-nature and more shrewdness than had been anticipated.\* The old Lorenzo had early recognized this quality in him, when he remarked of his three sons, Piero, Giuliano, and Giovanni, that the first was a fool, the second good, and the third prudent.

As Pope he showed this quality to a marked degree when, at a most critical moment, and against the advice of his counsellors, he decided, in the autumn of 1515, on holding a personal interview with the victor of Marignano. It took him indeed weeks, and even months, before he could make up his mind, during which time he ceaselessly turned the matter over and over, weighed all human possibilities, and struggled with himself without being able to come to a decision. When we compare his slow, cautious, anxious premeditation, his great indecision and frequent hesitations, with the fresh, bold, grand features which marked all the dealings of the genial Julius II., a doubly unfavourable impression is produced by the methods of the Medici Pope.

More revolting are the want of straightforwardness, nay, the falseness, the double-dealing by which the policy of Leo X., as a true statesman of the Renaissance, was almost

\* GUICCIARDINI, XIV., 4.



always actuated. The plan of "steering by two compasses" \* became the more readily a second nature to him, as he was constitutionally averse to making a final decision. Quite unabashed, he acted on the principle that, for the sake of being ready for every event, the conclusion of a treaty with one party need offer no obstacle to the conclusion of another in an opposite sense with his opponent.† By a double game, unique of its kind, he succeeded in making secret treaties simultaneously with rivals such as Francis I. and Charles V., the objects of which were at least quite irreconcilable‡ with the intentions of these two princes.

In order to explain and offer some excuse for such conduct, stress has been laid with reason on the unusually difficult position in which Leo X. found himself, as head of the States of the Church, between the two great powers of France and the Spanish-Hapsburg.§ Being much weaker than they, he tried to effect by craft what he was unable to accomplish by force. A further excuse for the Pope is to be found in the fact that double-dealing was the general mark of the policy of the age,|| and that

\* This striking expression is used by Ulmann. A contemporary says of Leo X. that he never sailed with one wind (VERDI, 103). It has been said in connection with a political transaction of the time of Sixtus V. (\*Discorsi politici de conclavi, a MS. from the Corvisieri Library, now in my possession) that Leo X. twisted about like a weather-cock; see CIAN, *loc. cit.*, 426, *n.*

† In 1531 Soriano relates (ALBÈRI, 2nd Series, III., 290) that Leo was known to have expressed himself in this sense.

‡ ULMANN, Studien, II., 91; *cf.* p. 185.

§ See RANKE, Pápste, I.<sup>8</sup>, 55-56; ULMANN, Studien, II., 97, and MASI, I., 136.

|| *Cf.* MASI, I., 137; FERRAJOLI in Arch. d. Soc. Rom., XIX., 438, *n.* 1; BROSCHE, England, VI., 90; BAUMGARTEN in Forsch. z. deutsch. Gesch., XXIII., 528; ULMANN, II., 461.

French diplomacy especially worked against him by the worst methods. Nevertheless, neither the difficulties of his position, nor the circumstance that his contemporaries held everything allowable in the diplomatic warfare, could justify Leo as Pope in acting in the same way as temporal princes, to whom the most solemn engagements and most sacred protestations were no better than empty words.\*

The peculiar pleasure taken by Leo X. in misleading, and in following crooked paths, as well as the indifference with which he made promises which could not possibly be kept, were closely connected with his desire to conceal from all alike the ultimate ends of his political dealings, so that in the after event, whatever the result, his policy could not be called in question. This quality was born and bred in him during the exile of the Medici from Florence, during which time he was taking eager part in all the plots for the restoration of his family to power.† Those years of mental development had a very unfortunate influence on his whole character. The habit of insincerity grew on him after he was Pope, when he found himself placed between the two great European antagonistic powers, who, if the States of the Church were to be maintained as an independent middle power, had to be balanced the one against the other.

Seldom has any statesman kept his thoughts, plans, and intentions so hidden from even his most intimate friends

\* It is highly characteristic of Leo X. that he should have declared to Castiglione that he might safely believe his bare word, seeing that he could equally deceive by Briefs and Bulls. Postscript to a \*Report of Castiglione's, dated from Rome, April 18, 1516. Gonzaga Archives, Mantua. See LUZIO'S Review of Pastor's "Leo X." in the *Corriere della sera*, 1906, No. 282.

† ULMANN, 94; *cf.* Vol. VII. of this work, p. 30.

and relatives as did Leo X., who spoke but little,\* and usually replied by a smile.† Many years later, Aleander said that he had never met a man who understood as well as Leo did how to keep his plans secret.‡ At first there was only one man, Cardinal Bibbiena, who was the Pope's confidant in all matters of political secrecy; but later, Giulio de' Medici filled the same position when he was made Vice-Chancellor in March, 1517.§ It is very interesting to see throughout the reports of the Venetian Ambassadors, how the influence of the relative grew year by year, and drove into the background that of Bibbiena, which had at the beginning been all-powerful.|| Earnest, capable,

\* This "prudētissima taciturnitas" has been extolled by VENUTI, 155.

† Cf. Paris de Grassis in GNOLI, *Secolo*, II., 638-639.

‡ Dil qual (Leone X.) mai vidi principe ne huomo più coperto al negociar. \*Aleander to Sanga from Ratisbon, March 25, 1532, Nunz. di Germania, LI., 103. Secret Archives of the Vatican.

§ Paris de Grassis in HEFELE-HERGENRÖTHER, VIII., 719; cf. Vol. VII. of this work, p. 198, n., and the \*Letter of Giuliano Caprili, Rome, 1517, March 11. State Archives, Modena.

|| As to Bibbiena, see *supra*, Vol. VII. of this work, pp. 84 *seq.* In September, 1514, Bibbiena and Giulio held equal positions: they alone knew all secrets (SANUTO, XIX., 27). Even until the autumn of 1515 Bibbiena often played the more important part. It was only in 1517 that Giulio supplanted him (Vol. VII. of this work, p. 122). In June, 1520, Minio says in his final report: "Il card. di Medici a gran poder col Papa, è homo di gran maneggio, ha grandissima autorità; tamen sa viver col Papa e non fa nulla se prima non domanda al Papa di cosse da conto—Il. card. Bibiena è appresso assa' dil Papa, ma questo Medici fa il tutto" (SANUTO, XXXI., 576). In July, 1521, Leo X. took counsel with Card. Medici alone (SANUTO, XXXI., 13). On July 28, 1521, Castiglione declares: \*Certo è che Medici è consapevole di ogni intentione del Papa (Gonzaga Archives, Mantua). In 1523 Gradenigo, looking back, reports: "Medici era il primo apréso Leone, homo di gran inzegno e cuor, e il Papa feva quello lui voleva" (SANUTO, XXXIV., 198).

moderate, and indefatigable in his work, Cardinal Giulio undertook an increasing portion of business, having as co-adjutors Giberti and Nicholas von Schönberg.\* Cardinal Medici often acted as a salutary counterweight to the frivolity, precipitation, and love of pleasure in his master.† In very important matters, such as the process against Luther, he was the real ruling spirit.‡ The influence he exercised is shown by the immediate effect of his temporary absences from the Papal Court.§ It appears that Cardinal Medici was always unwilling to leave Rome; reference is repeatedly made to his annoyance at being compelled, by urgent business, to go to Florence, or—as in 1521—to join the army as Legate.|| Often, as was the case in the summer of 1519, he had himself represented by his relative Cardinal Cibo.¶

Giulio de' Medici got on excellently with the Pope in spite of the many differences in their characters. When Leo, having lost by death nearly all his relatives, made his will in January, 1521, he made Cardinal Medici heir of all he possessed.\*\*

\* For more details about both of these, see under Clement VII., Vol. IX. of this work.

† REUMONT, III., 2, 62; *cf.*, by the same, *Gesch. Toskanas*, I., 16–17.

‡ *Cf.* Vol. VII. of this work, p. 394.

§ KALKOFF (*Prozess*, 404 *seqq.*, 402, *cf.* 131–136) draws especial attention to this.

|| *Cf. supra*, p. 58, and the report of Angelo Germanello to the Marquis of Mantua from Rome, Feb. 7, 1520: \*Heri partite de Roma el Card<sup>le</sup> de Medici per Fiorenza molto di mala voglia perche li recresceva lo andare et mezo indisposto de la persona et andò in lectica; la causa de la partita sua più celere che non haveva desegnato si fo alcuni tumulti et mal vivere se fa in Fiorenza. Gonzaga Archives, Mantua.

¶ SANUTO, XXVII., 414.

\*\* The original in the State Archives, Florence, printed in the *Arch. d. Soc. Rom.*, XXII., 567 *seqq.*



Those who stood at a distance from public affairs were under the impression that Leo X., being absorbed in a variety of other interests, left the actual management of his political business to Giulio.\* But, as a matter of fact, although, after 1517, the Cardinal held, in a certain sense, the position of Prime Minister and carried on nearly all the correspondence with the Nuncios, he had to take the Pope's opinion on all matters of even secondary importance before despatch of business.† This had been the case also with Bibbiena.‡ Any important business with the Ambassadors of the great powers was, as a rule, carried on by the Pope in person. He would converse with them for hours together, cleverly concealing his own views while, by apparently agreeing with them, he drew out the opinions and intentions of the diplomatists with whom he was treating.§

The lavish generosity of the Pope had a fateful effect on the political aims which he pursued with so much cleverness, dissimulation, and acumen; for it soon deprived him of those means without which the most skilful statesman cannot possibly attain his object at the critical moment.

The Pope's entourage, his Court, above all his Florentine compatriots, and the whole swarm of literati, were naturally enchanted by the showers of gold which rained

\* Cf. the *Vita Anonyma* in ROSCOE-HENKE, III., 629 *seqq.*, and Fr. Novellus \**Vita Leonis X.* in the Cod. Barb., lat. 2273, f. 106, of the Vatican Library.

† The Venetian Ambassador, M. Minio, states this clearly and precisely, ALBÈRI, 2nd Series, III., 64. Cf. ULMANN, *loc. cit.*, 92, and MASI, I., 212.

‡ Cf. RICHARD, 347.

§ Sanuto's despatches afford many instances of this. RICHARD, in his treatise on the beginnings of the French nunciature, originated by Leo X., extols the latter as "pontife diplomate par excellence." Rev. de quest. hist., 1905, II., 147.

on them, and they exalted Leo to the skies. Being benevolent by nature, the Pope liked to make others happy as far as it lay in his power. Without troubling himself whether the recipients of his bounty were deserving and necessitous, he squandered on them the resources at his disposal. "By his pleasure in giving he showed real greatness, for all ostentation and artificial display were far from him,"\* as was proved by his indifference to outward ceremonial. His kind and generous nature often led him to relax the strictness of canonical precepts: but, in order to satisfy his suppliants, and not without inward protest, he granted petitions which went too far. So reluctant was he to grant some of these extravagant requests, that he appealed to the experienced but certainly not over-conscientious Cardinal Pucci to protect him against making mistakes of this sort through want of caution.† Giovio, who relates this, adds that, driven by the necessities of war, and moved by his enthusiasm for art and learning, and caring more for the enrichment of others than of himself, Leo X. reluctantly neglected much in the way of financial business. This, however, cannot excuse his unscrupulous and wanton extravagance.

Julius II. had been an economical and skilful financier. Without burdening his subjects with new taxes, and in spite of his many wars, he had contrived to leave to his successor a considerable sum in his treasury.‡ Leo X. seems to have looked on this as inexhaustible, and with open hand squandered that which his predecessor had been at such pains to accumulate. Natural generosity, nepotism,§ a passionate love of art and literature together

\* GEIGER, *Renaissance*, 285.

† JOVIUS, *Vita*, lib. 4.

‡ Cf. Vol. VI. of this work, 223 *seqq.*

§ CIAN, *Musa Medicea*, 8.

with that of magnificence and luxury, combined to devour the savings of Julius II. in the short space of two years.\* Bibbiena, who had general charge of the finances at the beginning of Leo's Pontificate,† ought to have considered it his duty to warn and check the Pope in his expenditure; but that light-hearted Tuscan proved to be as careless about money matters as his master. Although the parsimonious Ferdinando Ponzetti, who succeeded Bibbiena as treasurer as early as the autumn of 1513,‡ was very ingenious in devising new sources of income, he could not restore the balance in the Papal exchequer, for Leo continued to give on every side with a free hand. For instance, he gave a wedding present to his brother Giuliano to the amount of 16,000 ducats.§ In the spring of 1515 the Papal treasury had reached low water mark, and never after this time was Leo X. freed from his financial difficulties.

The most varied methods were tried to procure money. Very early the Pope had recourse to the plan of creating new places and offices;|| and later on, doubtful and even reprehensible measures were resorted to. But all the devices which were tried to improve the finances were of no avail: neither ordinary nor extraordinary income

\* SANUTO, XX., 341.

† Regest. Leonis X., n. 43.

‡ *Ibid.*, n. 4647; cf. VITALI, *Tesorieri*, xxxvi. *seqq.*, and GOTTLÖB, *Camera Apostolica*, 277.

§ According to the specific statement of L. Canossa (in FABRONIUS, 278 *seq.*), Giuliano's annual income amounted to 59,600 ducats. According to JOVIUS (*Vita*, lib. 3), the marriage of Giuliano cost the Pope 150,000 ducats. But this figure is manifestly too high. Giovio is very little to be relied on in his numerical statements. He puts the inhabitants of Rome at too high a number, and the cost of Raphael's cartoons at too high a figure.

|| Regest. Leonis X., n. 9787; see SANUTO, XX., 142. Cf. 362, 400, 426; XXII., 217.

sufficed in the remotest degree to meet the need. This deficiency was increased considerably by the war of Urbino, which, from the beginning, devoured enormous sums.\* The consequence of that unfortunate undertaking was complete financial ruin, from which the Pope tried to extricate himself by raising loans, not only from bankers, but also from private individuals, Cardinals, and members of the Curia.† But all this was of as little avail as were the financial devices which the ingenious Cardinals Armellini and Pucci openly employed to procure money.‡

The sources upon which we can draw to ascertain the exact state of Leo's balance-sheet are very scanty. The register of receipts and expenditure of the Apostolic Exchequer does not in any way suffice for an accurate statement, partly because it was imperfectly kept, and partly because there were also other financial departments.§ The most important of these was the Pope's private treasury, under the control of the influential private chamberlain Giovanni Lazzaro Serapica.|| There exist three volumes—extending

\* SANUTO, XXIII., 554; XXIV., 142, 144, 180, 274, 376. Cf. Vol. VII. of this work, p. 211 *seq.*

† Cf. the \*testimony of Cornelius de Fine, given in Vol. VII. of this work, p. 212 n. (National Library, Paris).

‡ SCHULTE, I., 223.

§ See SCHULTE, I., 253, which gives a good insight into the \*Introitus and Exitus of Leo's Pontificate, preserved in the Secret Archives of the Vatican, as also the other accounts of the Exchequer which are kept there. For the value of the State Archives, see *infra*, pp. 93-94, n.

|| Serapica played under Leo X. the same important part which Accursio played under Julius II. According to SANUTO, XXV., 288, he came from Albano. His real name was Giovanni Lazzaro de' Magistris (the nickname of Serapica was given to him on account of his small stature). He was at first master of the hounds to Cardinal Sanseverino (cf. GNOLI, *Cacce*, 11 *seqq.*), which was made the occasion of continual ridicule on the part of the satirists (see ROSSI, Pasquinate,



from July, 1516, to November, 1521—of accounts kept by Serapica of the privy expenditure ; all others are missing.\*

134 *seqq.*). He was already in the service of Leo when he was Cardinal de' Medici, and was one of his six conclavists (DELICATI-ARMELLINI, *Diario di Paride di Grassis*, 93). In the \*Rotulus of 1514 (see *infra*, p. 105 n.) Serapica appears as the third or fourth of the chamberlains. Even then he was on intimate terms with Leo X. ; see BASCHET, *Catherine de Médicis*, 244. The Pope rewarded him liberally for his faithful service ; SANUTO, XXVIII., 361, XXIX., 192 ; see Regest. Leonis X., n. 3909 *seq.*, 6105–6107, 6122, 6993, 7217, 12,551, 13,885, 16,861, and Secret Archives of the Vatican, Arm., XXXIX., t. 31, 1516, n. 43 : \*Pro magistro Io. Lazzaro Serapica de Magistris notario et famil. : Licentia capiendi possessionem monast. S. Leonis Tullens. dioc. ord. can. regul. s. August. D. Romae, 1516, Sept. 6, 1518, n. 82 : \*Letter to two canons of Ghent about the benefices there for Ioh. Lazzaro Serapica de Magistris cleric. Aquil. famil. contin. commens. ac. cam. nost. sec. D. Rome, 1518, Iunii, 26. Cf. also the \*receipt of Nov. 11, 1517, in Div. Cam., 67, f. 67. When travelling to Loreto in 1518, Serapica also visited Venice, where he was treated like a great lord (SANUTO, XXV., 294, 299, 348). In Rome he took part in the Carnival races (*ibid.*, XXVII., 68, 73, and ADEMOLLO, *Aless.*, VI., etc., 83 *seqq.*) ; he was also distinguished as a bold sportsman (see CESAREO in the treatise quoted *infra*, and GNOLI, *loc. cit.*). It seems that he usually lived in the Vatican (SANUTO, XXX., 466) and also at the Belvedere, where he was sometimes the guest of Leo X. (SANUTO, XXV., 438 ; Manoscr. Torrig., XXIII., 22) ; yet he had a house in the city (ARMELLINI, *Censimento*, 55). He was so well off that he was able to advance considerable sums of money to the Pope. After the death of Leo X. he was arrested for embezzlement. Was this accusation founded on fact ? In the \*Inventarium bonorum in foraria Leonis X. (State Archives, Rome), quoted *infra*, it is said in several places : “Dicunt Serapicam habuisse,” which at any rate show that Serapica made a wrong use of his position. He was set at liberty after the death of Adrian VI. (SANUTO, XXXIV., 244, 257, 438) ; see CESAREO in the *Nuova Rassegna*, 1894, II., No. 8, who believes Serapica to have been better than was reported.

\* GREGOROVIVS searched for the account-books of Leo X. in the State Archives of Rome. His assumption that they are all missing (*Histor. Zeitschr.*, XXXVI., 158) is quite as mistaken as is his surmise

The loss of these important account-books, to which Serapica's register often refers, is deplorable.

Amid this debris of official sources\* we have to rely for essentials on the statements of the Venetian Ambassadors, which must always be accepted with reserve, and, in places, certainly set the figures too high. But, taken as a whole, the representatives of the great mercantile state were well-informed about financial matters. Their final reports for

that "they were perhaps destroyed in order to leave no traces of the extravagance of this epicurean." There are actually existing in the State Archives in Rome : (I.) *Obligazioni per servizi*, one volume, extending from 1513 to 1516 (*cf.* SCHULTE, I., 256); (II.) *Annatae*, (1) 1512-1513, (2) 1513, (3) 1516, (4) 1517, (5) 1517-1518, (6) 1519-1520, (7) 1520-1521; (III.) *Formatori*, 2 vols., *cf.* *Römische Quartalschrift*, VIII., 456 *seqq.*; (IV.) *Mandati camerali* 1513-1523, 1 vol.; (V.) *Spese minute di palazzo*, and also the register of expenditure of Leonardo di Zanobi Bartholini (see Vol. VII. of this work, 39 n.); (2) *Serapica, Spese private di Leone X.*, 3 vols. SCHULTE (I. 256) knows only the first of these volumes, extending from July 28, 1516, to Jan. 17, 1519, of which CERASOLI (*Studi e doc.*, XIV., 394) also made use. But in 1893 GNOLI (*Cacce*, II) had his attention drawn to the two other volumes, and took printed information from them (38 *seqq.*; *cf.*, further, *Secolo di Leone X.*, II., 632). As Gnoli intends to publish these *Spese private di Leone X.* in a complete form (*Secolo*, II., 643), I will confine myself here to a few particulars. The volume 1516-1519, of which CESAREO made use in the *Nuova Rassegna*, 1894, II., No. 8, and *Leone X.*, 199 *seq.*, I will quote as *Spese di Serapica*, I. The volume is oblong, and bound in brown stamped leather, bearing on the outside the arms of Leo X. At the end of the year (f. 44-5) the Pope has signed it with a firm hand : *Ita est J[oa]nnes*. The next volume—quoted by me as *Spese*, II.—follows immediately, for the first entry is on Jan. 23, 1519; it is bound like the last, and also written by Serapica himself, and finished on the 15th of December, 1520. The third volume—quoted as *Spese*, III.—is one continued by Gentile de Gualdo (servant to Card. Armellini) to Feb. 17, 1522, from the original ending. It extends from Dec. 16, 1520, to Nov. 20, 1521.

\* The series of the *Spese del maggiordomo* in the State Archives, Rome, contains nothing about Leo X.

the years 1517, 1520, 1523 give a most interesting insight into the Pope's money affairs.\*

Marino Giorgi, in March, 1517, reckons the state income of Leo X. to have been about 420,000 ducats.† Of this, 60,000 ducats came from the river tax in Rome (Ripa grande), about 33,000 from the land tax, and 8000 from the tax on wine. Spoleto, the Marches of Ancona, and the Romagna contributed about 180,000. The alum works at Tolfa, according to Giorgi's apparently exaggerated statement,‡ brought in 40,000. The salt marshes of Cervia, in conjunction with the revenues of Ravenna, brought in from 60,000 to 100,000 ducats. To these were to be added the spiritual revenues, which by their nature were subject to great fluctuations. The returns of the annates have been generally estimated at 100,000 ducats, though half of these (the first-fruits of bishoprics and abbeys) belonged to the

\* The Venetian reports were first published by ALBÈRI, 2nd Series, III., 39 *seqq.*, 61 *seqq.*, 65 *seq.*, more correctly by SANUTO, XXIV, 84 *seqq.*, XXVIII., 586 *seqq.*, XXXIV., 127 *seq.* Among modern writers see COPPI, *Discorso s. le finanze di Roma*, Roma, 1847, and REUMONT, III., 2, 280 *seqq.* Some of the Venetians' statements, *e.g.* the 8000 ducats monthly for the expenses of housekeeping, can hardly be correct. See *infra*, note †.

† The value of a ducat, or gold gulden, can be approximately estimated as equal to that of ten German Reichsmark. A calculation of what would be its value at the present day is impossible with our imperfect knowledge of the money, coinage, and prices at that time; see POGATSCHER'S instructive treatise on the issue of books of accounts of the Apostolic Exchequer, in the Viennese periodical "Die Kultur," II. (1901), 469, and LUSCHIN VON EBENGREUTH, *Münzkunde und Geldgeschichte*, Munich, 1904, 183-192. Cf. MÜNTZ, *Les Arts à la cour du Pape d'Innocent VIII.*, etc., Paris, 1898, 40.

‡ It appears from Regest. Leonis X., n. 3510, that he let the alumpits to the company of Andrea Bellanti for twelve years for 15,000 duc. annually. Cf. GOTTLOB, *Cam. apost.*, 305. About a loan of 75,000 ducats made by Leo X. from A. Bellanti, see *Arch. d. Soc. Rom.*, II., 478.



Sacred College. The new tax of "compositions,"\* introduced by Sixtus IV., brought in an equal sum, but sometimes only 60,000 ducats. To this must be added the returns of saleable offices, which were considerably increased by Leo X. He added no fewer than six hundred and twelve new members to the College of the one hundred and forty-one *Porzionari di Ripa* founded by Julius II., whereby he gained 286,000 ducats. He added sixty members to the College of the *Cubiculari* and a hundred and forty to that of the *Scudieri*. The former paid a gross sum of 90,000 and the latter 112,000 ducats.† Finally, in 1520, by the advice of Cardinal Pucci, and for the express purpose of making money to clear the debt consequent on the war of Urbino, he founded the new College of the *Cavalieri di S. Pietro*. Each of its four hundred and one members paid down a sum of 1000 ducats. Hereby a capital sum of 401,000 ducats was raised, bringing in interest at more than 10 per cent., which was assigned for different purposes. Besides this the *Cavalieri* received a number of privileges, such as enrolment in the Roman nobility, the title of Count Palatine, and the right to inspect the accounts of the Exchequer.‡ Purchase was invited by the bait of these

\* Cf. Vol. IV. of this work, 420 *seq.*

† Cf. *Bulla offic. cubicular. et scutiferor. apost.*, dat. Romae, 1515, 9 Cal. Aug. A contemporary and rare impression is in the Rossiana Library, Vienna. FABRONIUS, 292; MORONE, LXXXVII., 89; GOTTLOB, *Cam. apost.*, 251. In the \**Introitus et Exitus*, 551, f. 92, there is an entry of a receipt for 202,000 ducats "ab officiis scutiferorum et cubiculariorum"; cf. f. 215. Secret Archives of the Vatican.

‡ The Bull about the *Cavalieri di S. Pietro*, July 30, 1520, which SCHULTE (I., 223) quotes from the Vatican register, was printed at the time. I found one copy in the Rossiana Library, Vienna, a collection which is unusually rich in rare documents of the kind. About the *Cavalieri di S. Pietro*, cf. also SANUTO, XXIX., 77, 113, 633, and *Corp. Dipl. Port.*, II., 33.



privileges, though the essential importance of the office of Cavaliere consisted in the enjoyment of the interest. Like most other saleable (*vacabili*) offices, this institution was in reality nothing but a system of raising loans by life annuities.\* According to the Venetian Ambassador Gradenigo, the number of saleable offices amounted at the death of Leo X. to two thousand one hundred and fifty, representing a capital of nearly three million ducats, and an annual income of 328,000 ducats for the possessors, who on an average received more than 10 per cent. for the sums they had paid to the State.†

Apart from tithes, jubilees and indulgences, the number of which were multiplied to excess for this purpose, supplied huge sources of revenue. As these had sunk "almost entirely" into a mere financial jobbery, they caused great and justifiable scandal.‡ The monetary stress, however, continued much as before, since the greater part of these sums did not go straight into the Papal Exchequer; for both princes and bankers first of all assured themselves of their own very considerable share. Moreover, indulgences did not now bring in so much money as they had done formerly.§

In 1517 Leo X. made use of the punishment of the Cardinals implicated in Petrucci's conspiracy, to gather in enormous sums from them. He also turned to the same account the unprecedentedly numerous creation of Cardinals soon afterwards.|| In spite of these expedients, the need of money remained a standing evil; for the Pope never

\* Cf. RANKE, *Päpste* I.<sup>7</sup>, 264; REUMONT, III., 2, 281 *seq.* See also COPPI, *Finanze*, 2-3; GOTTLÖB, 245 *seq.*, 251.

† REUMONT, III., 2, 283-284.

‡ Cf. Vol. VII. of this work, 341 *seq.*

§ Cf. SCHULTE, I., 185 *seq.*

|| Cf. Vol. VII. of this work, 179 *seq.*, 189 *seq.*, 202.

VOL. VIII.

dreamed of making economics. When his nephew Lorenzo went to France in 1518, he was fitted out in the most extravagant way.\* The Pope shrank from no method of gaining money, and even the highest offices were sold.† The office of Camerlengo, like that of Cardinal, became a matter of purchase. Innocenzo Cibo paid 30,000, or, according to other accounts, 35,000 or 40,000 ducats for the former post, which he held for only a few months.‡ His successor, Francesco Armellini, is said to have paid 60,000 or 70,000 ducats for the succession.§ But all these

\* VERDI, 95 *seq.*

† "Omnia sunt venalia," writes the Venetian Ambassador; SANUTO, XXX., 188. Cf. Manuel's report in LLORENTE, I., 475, 476, 481, and the satires of 1518 in the *Giorn. d. lett. Ital.*, XVII., 335 *seqq.*

‡ After the death of Riario (July 7, 1521, see Vol. VII. of this work, p. 193) Cibo received the office of Camerlengo "excluso Armellino qui magnam controversiam fecerit," as we are told by Biagio di Barone Martinelli da Cesena in his *\*Diarium*. He took possession of the office on August 7 (DELICATI-ARMELLINI, 86); but already on October 2 "Card. Armellinus cepit possessionem Camerariatus officii, in Camera apost. exhibuit litteras officii, etc., Card. Cibo propter hoc discessit a curia indignatus." *\*Diarium cit.* Cf. GARAMPI, App., 197, and MARINI, I., 271.

§ SANUTO, XXXI., 106, 117, 404, 453; XXXII., 8. Cf. CESAREO in *Nuova Rassegna*, 1894, I., 71 *seqq.* B. Castiglione reports on July 16, 1521, to the Marquis of Mantua: *\*Scrisse a V. Ex. alli di passati che mons. rev. Cibo havea havuto il camerlengato e fù vero, pur mons. Armellino ne offerse al papa quaranta milia ducati di modo che così bella proferta fece un poco titubare el papa in questi tempi di bisogno di modo che mons. Cibo ha pagato trenta milia et hallo ottenuto.* On July 24: *\*This morning, "in Consistorio," Cibo was appointed Camerlengo, et ha pagato trentum duc. ; Sept. 19: \*Quella (V. Ex.) haverà saputo come monsig. rev. Cibo hebbe a questi di el camerlengato e poi a N. S. è piacciuto che S. S<sup>ria</sup> R<sup>ma</sup> lo renunti a monsig. Armellino il quale ha pagato molti e molti migliara de ducati e così ha havuto il camerlengato; penso bene che N. S. darà a monsig. rev. Cibo tal contracambio che se ne contenterà (Gonzaga Archives, Mantua).* The "Frenchman living in Rome" is guilty of exaggeration when he says

sums melted away as soon as they had been paid in. How could it have been otherwise with a Pope of whom Vettori says that a stone could more easily fly up into the air of itself than Leo could keep possession of a thousand ducats!\*

If the Venetian Ambassador, Marino Giorgi, is to be believed, 8000 ducats were spent monthly on gifts and card-playing.† Forty-eight thousand ducats covered the expenses of the Papal household under Julius II.; but, according to credible accounts,‡ this sum was doubled under his successor. If we bear in mind that the whole of the Papal income was not more than from 500,000 to 600,000 ducats, we can see how out of proportion was the expenditure mentioned. To this there was added after 1516 the cost of the Urbino war, which devoured altogether 800,000.§ After this Cardinal Armellini advised the Pope to raise the price of salt; but this attempt was frustrated by the determined resistance of the inhabitants of the Romagna. Nothing more of the kind was again attempted; in fact, taxes remained so low in the States of the Church that they really did not do more than cover the cost of their administration.|| Money, however, had to be procured, that Armellini paid 80,000 ducats (\*Diary in Cod. Barb., lat. 3552, of the Vatican Library). According to a \*Report from J. Ginodi, dated Rome, 1521, July 8, to the Duke of Savoy, the salary of the office of Camerlengo was 6000 ducats (State Archives, Turin, Roma, I.).

\* VETTORI, 322.

† SANUTO, XXIV., 93. Leo X. never gave gratuities of less than a ducat, and often much more; thus *e.g.*, on May 8, 1520: *al barcarolo che sta al ponte per mancia duc. 5*; Oct. 25: *A dui muratori che hanno murato el palazzo de Monterosoli per mancia duc. 8*. \*Spese di Serapica, State Archives, Rome.

‡ Card. Riario to the Venetian Ambassador, SANUTO, XXIV., 91-92.

§ Cf. Vol. VII. of this work, 211 *seq.*

|| Vianesius Albergatus in RANKE, Pápste, I.<sup>7</sup>, 265.

and loans were raised for which sometimes no less than 40 per cent. was paid.\*

In this way the state of finances went down-hill with ever-increasing rapidity. Debt was heaped upon debt until the tapestries of the palace, the silver plate off the table, the jewels of the tiara, and the valuable statues of the Apostles in the Papal chapel were pledged,† and yet nothing could stop up the Danaids' sieve. The troops had to wait for their pay, the University professors and artists, even of the rank of Raphael and Giuliano di Sangallo, for their stipends.‡ “The yellow-green brass doors of the Pantheon are said to contain the weight of many coins,” remarks a contemporary with just irony; “but were this so, Leo X. would not leave them in their place.”§ It was only by the greatest exertion and by paying an enormous rate of interest that money could be raised for the war against France in 1521.|| During the course of this war the financial need increased to such an extent that Leo and his confidants, especially Pucci and Armellini, contemplated measures which can only be called desperate. New offices were to be created, court places and prelacies were to be taxed, the Lake of Trasimene was to be sold. A tax on corn was again spoken of, and there was to be another

\* SANUTO, XXIV., 92.

† Cf. Gradenigo's report of 1523 in ALBÈRI, 2nd Series, III., 71; SANUTO, XXX., 130; SCHULTE, I., 227; and Arch. d. Soc. Rom., II., 215 *seq.*, especially the inventory of the “*gemmae et pretiosa iocalia loco pignoris praefato Sigismondo (Chigi) assignata pro dictis 10 m. duc.*” (May 10, 1521) in FEA, Notizie, 90–92.

‡ Cf. FABRICIUS in Jahrb. d. preuss. Kunstsamml., 23, Beiheft, p. 24, and *infra*, p. 275.

§ SANUTO, XXXIV., 220.

|| See SANUTO, XXX., 31, 90, 130, 173, 188, 351 *seqq.*, and the \*Diary of CORNELIUS DE FINE in the National Library, Paris. See also NITTI, 423 *seqq.*, and SCHULTE, I., 224.



great nomination of Cardinals, the names of whom were already being circulated. There was, futhermore, a talk of selling Terracina to the Gaetani for 100,000 ducats.\* Lastly, an expedient was discussed of requiring all the Pope's relatives and confidants to pledge their collective benefices.† When, therefore, Leo X. died suddenly, his creditors, who had, by reason of his youth, counted on a longer reign, stood on the brink of financial ruin. A Roman report given in Sanuto (December 5, 1521) contains further particulars of the financial crisis, which was such as had never before been experienced in Rome. The Bini bank was hardest hit, with claims of 200,000 ducats; this house, like that of Strozzi, was threatened with failure. The Gaddi had lent 32,000, the Ricasoli 10,000, the datary Turini 16,000, and the trusted chamberlain Serapica 18,000 ducats. Cardinal Salviati's claim amounted to 80,000 ducats; and he, with his colleagues Ridolfi and Rangoni, had renounced all their benefices in order to raise money for the Pope; ruin therefore stared them in the face, as it did Cardinals Pucci and Armellini. The former had lent Leo 150,000 ducats and the latter his whole fortune. In short, says the informant, all the Pope's favourites and servants are ruined: yet, though they lament their misfortune, they do not blame him who is dead, but rather bewail the loss of so kind a master.‡ How far the figures given above are individually correct is uncertain.§

\* SANUTO, XXX., 351; XXXI., 13; XXXII., 8, 116, 118. Camillo Gaetani lent Leo 10,000 golden ducats, for the recovery of Parma and Piacenza; see the \*Dichiarazione of the Cardinal Camerlengo, dated Dec. 14, 1521, in the Gaetani Archives, Rome (Cassa, 71, n. 28).

† SANUTO, XXXI., 13.

‡ SANUTO, XXXII., 236-237. The date, Nov. 5, in Sanuto is a clerical error.

§ SCHULTE (I., 227) believes with reason that the sums are much exaggerated. But he gives documentary evidence that the Venetian

The statements of the Venetian Ambassador Gradenigo are more trustworthy, as he expressly refers to the estimate submitted by the Cardinal Camerlengo, Armellini. According to this Leo X. expended during his Pontificate four and a half million ducats, and died owing four hundred thousand more.\* A pasquinade puts into words the common, and probably correct, opinion current in Rome; "Leo has eaten up three Pontificates: the treasury of Julius II., the revenues of his own Pontificate, and those of his successor."†

In citing the enormous expenditure in the Pope's household, Marino Giorgi laconically remarks: "The cause of this is to be found in the number of Florentines who allow themselves to be supported by the good-nature of the Pope."‡ "The treasury of the Pope is empty," writes

statement of the scheme for procuring money by pledging the benefices by the Pope's confidants, is based on truth (227).

\* SANUTO, XXXII., 230. In what, it is true, is an anonymous letter, it is said that Armellini reckoned the deficit in the Apostolic Exchequer at 80,660 ducats; in this document the whole expenditure during the Pontificate of Leo X. is put at 5,050,000 ducats. The Envoy from Mayence, Teutleben, and also Pandolfo Pico della Mirandola (\*Letter of Dec. 16, 1521, to the Marquis of Mantua, in the Gonzaga Archives, Mantua), puts the debts at 800,000 ducats (SCHULTE, I., 224). Francis I. estimated them at 1,200,000 crowns (HÖFLER, Adrian VI., 66). Girolamo Severino wrote on Jan. 7th, 1522, to Charles V. that the already ascertained amount of the debts of Leo X. came to more than 850,000 ducats. Well-informed persons said that the debts over and above amounted to 300,000 ducats (BERGENROTH, II., n. 373). TIZIO, \*Hist. Senen., writes: "Relatum est Leonem pontificem Cameram apost. exhaustam reliquisse atque alieno gravatam ere nongentorum quinquaginta milium aureorum et mitram quam regnum appellant Chisiis pignorassee mercatoribus" (Cod. G, II., 39, f. 65, Chigi Library, Rome).

† SANUTO, XXXII., 356. Still more severe is the pasquinade in CESAREO, 207 *seq.*

‡ SANUTO, XXIV., 92. Cf. the payments in AMATI, 217 *seqq.*

Marco Minio in 1520, "because he is so generous that he does not know how to keep back any money; and the Florentines do not leave him a soldo." \*

In former times the fellow-countrymen of the reigning Pontiff had often made their home in Rome. Under Callixtus III. and Alexander VI. it had been the Spaniards; under Pius II. the Sienese; under Sixtus IV. the Ligurians, who had come in flocks to the Papal Court. But an inundation such as the Eternal City now experienced at the hands of the Florentines had never been known before. In vain did Leo X., who knew but too well what his fellow-countrymen were, try to check the inflow,† which was enormous, even in the first days of his Pontificate.‡ The greediness of these people was boundless; they believed that all benefices and offices existed for them alone.§ With a truly mercantile spirit they tried to draw from the position of Leo X. every possible advantage for themselves.|| Soon no fewer than thirty Florentine banks had been opened in Rome.¶

Ariosto, in his witty satire to Annibale Maleguccio,\*\* describes how "the gentlemen from Florence" exhausted the fountains of Papal favour:—

I nipoti e i parenti, che son tanti,  
Prima anno a ber; poi quei che l'ajutaro  
A vestirsi il più bel di tutti i manti.

\* SANUTO, XXVIII., 576.

† NITTI, 19-20.

‡ Cf. SANUTO, XVI., 72; LUZIO-RENIER, Mantova e Urbino, 210; LUZIO, Isabella d'Este, 82 and 92.

§ See BASCHET, Catherine de Médicis, 241.

|| Cf. VETTORI, 300; SANUTO, XXVIII., 361.

¶ SCHULTE, I., 16.

\*\* Satire to Annibale Malaguccio, Parnaso Italiano, Vol. XXVII., 28, 29, Venezia, 1787.

Bevuto ch' abbian questi, gli sia caro  
 Che beano quei che contra il Soderino  
 Per tornarlo in Firenze si levaro.  
 L'un dice: io fui con Pietro in Casentino,  
 E d' esser preso e morto a risco venni:  
 Lo gli prestai denar,' grida Brandino.  
 Dice un altro; a mie spese il frate tenni  
 Un anno, e lo rimessi in veste e in arme;  
 Di cavallo e d' argento gli sovvenni.

With increasing displeasure the Romans saw how the Florentines squeezed themselves into every post, and especially into financial offices. Quite in the early days of Leo's Pontificate, Filippo Strozzi was appointed Receiver-General of the Papal Exchequer,\* and gathered together under him many of his fellow-countrymen. The office of Treasurer-General was first given to the Tuscan, Bibbiena, and after him to his compatriot Ferdinando Ponzetti;† relatives of both obtained lucrative subordinate posts. The treasurership of the county of Venaissin was confided to Pietro de' Pazzi in 1514.‡ The management of the Datary was in the hands of Tuscans—first Pucci, and after him Passerini, Benassao and Turini da Pescia.§

\* SCHULTE, I., 224.

† VITALI, XXXVI.

‡ GOTTLOB, *Cam. apost.*, 100.

§ SCHULTE, I., 264 *seq.* In addition to the statement of Schulte about Latino Beneassai or Benassao, it must be here remarked that he was sent to France in November 1516, whence he returned to Rome on March 11, 1517, where next day he made his report to the Pope; see *Manosc. Torrig.*, XX., 244 *seqq.*, 367 *seqq.* In this L. Benassao is described as Papal treasurer: it is certain that he is identical with the Latinus Benesax in the \*Rotulus of Leo X. (*Cod. Vat.*, 8598), whom FRIEDENSBURG (*Quellen u. Forsch. d. preuss. Inst.*, VI., 68) was not able to identify. The year of Latino's death is given in SANUTO, XXV., 348. The Venetian Envoy announces the death



The number of the Pope's fellow-countrymen in his personal court was unusually large. There were to be found representatives of nearly all the great families of Florence: the Albizzi, Passerini, Michelozzi, Ricasoli, Gaddi, Capponi, Alamanni, Tornabuoni, and others. The Majordomo Alessandro Neroni was also a Florentine.\* There is in his department an official list of the Papal Court and household, dated the 1st of May 1514,† which with little alteration would hold good for at least two years and a half. It shows the enormous number of the household staff (*famiglia*) of the Medici Pope. According to this document the total number of these was originally six hundred and eighty-three; namely, two hundred and forty four "gentlemen" or occupants of the higher court places, a hundred and seventy-four special officials, and two hundred and sixty-five servants—in all about four times as many as the members of the "*famiglia*" of Pius II.‡ The first class, "gentlemen," which was again subdivided into five divisions, included the domestic prelates (*praelati domestici*), twenty-seven in number, among them being two Archbishops and six Bishops. The humanists Bembo, of Latino on April 6, 1518, at the age of only thirty, with the appointment of Turini as Datary. See also KALKOFF in the *Arch. f. Ref. Gesch.* I., 384.

\* In 1514 A. Neroni received the *praeceptor* of the Hospital of Santo Spirito (Regest Leonis X., n. 12,550). On August 16, 1523, Adrian VI. appointed him to the Commissario dell' Annona in Corneto and the whole Patrimony (Cod. Vat., 7124, f. 154, Vatican Library). On May 2, 1514, we find the first entry of payment to Alex. de Neronibus mag. dom. S. D. N. in \*Introitus et Exitus, 552 (Secret Archives of the Vatican).

† \*Rottulus familiae Smi D. N. (Cod. Vat., 8598 of the Vatican Library). Cf. FRIEDENSBURG in *Quellen und Forsch.*, VI., 53-71. Ferrajoli is preparing a complete account of this Rotulus with an explanation of all the names.

‡ See MARINI, *Archiatry*, II., 152, 156.

Sadoletto, Filippo Beroaldo, Giovanni Poggio, and Zaccaria Ferreri belonged to this highest class. Then came sixty-four chamberlains, of whom the best known are Serapica, Ercole Rangoni, and Baldassare Turini da Pescia, besides two physicians and a surgeon.\* In this class also the majority were Italians and mostly compatriots of the Pope; but there were also some Spaniards, and among the chamberlains, one German. Numerous Florentines were also in the third section, the *cubiculari*, sixty-eight in number, but among these were two Germans, and a well-known personality, the blind improvisatore, Raffaello Brandolini. The next section, the *scudieri*, were numbered at ninety-four; among them were several musicians; to this class belonged the poetaster Baraballo and the keeper of the famous elephant. The fifth and last class comprised the chaplains, under which honourable title were comprised most various offices. Among others were the two *clerici capellæ*, two *forieri*, the *plumbator*, the penitentiary, the custodians of the Library, of the Belvedere, of petitions, and also the keeper of the Vatican vineyard. The real household officials (*officiales*) were rigorously separated from these higher court officials; and they too were subdivided into two classes.†

Florentines or Tuscans were in the pay of the Pope as men of letters, artists, and rhetoricians: even the well-known court fools came thence.‡ Among the administrative

\* D. Iacopus chirurgicus, manifestly the same as Giacomo di Bartol. da Brescia, mentioned *supra*, p. 75 n.

† Here, and also among the servants, Germans were well represented. They formed a tenth part of the whole staff. FRIEDENBURG, *loc. cit.*, 71; *cf.* SCHMIDLIN, *Gesch. d. Anima*, 261 *seq.* About the German domestics and writers of Leo X., see *Histor-polit. Bl.*, CVIII., 740 *seq.*

‡ *Cf.* CESAREO, 214. See *ibid.* for the satires directed against the Florentines.

officials Guicciardini is the most celebrated. While he, by his severe measures against banditti, showed how order could be maintained, other officials oppressed those over whom they were set to such a degree that the most bitter hatred was aroused against them.\* The Pope's compatriots also held many military appointments,† and were much employed on diplomatic service. What has been already said shows the important part played by Cardinal Bibbiena together with Giulio de' Medici. An elder brother of the Cardinal, Pietro Bibbiena, was Nuncio at Venice from 1513 to 1514.‡ Pietro Ardinghello, a member of a noble Florentine family, was the Pope's secretary for his private correspondence.§

\* Cf. M. Giorgi's report of 1517 in ALBÈRI, 2nd Series, III., 55. This is surely exaggerated.

† From the \*Introitus et Exitus (Secret Archives of the Vatican) I made the following notes:—Vol. 551, f. 162: Simon de Tornabonis revisor gent. armor. S. D. N. (cf. f. 217); f. 164: Hieronymus de Albicis capit. balisterior. (equestrium custodie palatii) (cf. f. 177b); f. 174: Barthol. de Bibiena superstant. munit. S. D. N. (July, 1513); f. 227b: Iac° Florentin. superstant. artiglarie D. N. (December 30, 1513); f. 243: Hieronymus de Albicis capit. custodie equor. levis armat. S. D. N. (March 1514).—Vol. 552: Bernardo de Bibiena superstanti munit. palatii (May 31, 1514). Barthol. de Bibiena superst. tramit. (September 4, 1514).—Vol. 553, repeatedly: Bernard. de Bibiena superst. munit. and Simon de Tornabonis commiss. gen. armor. Here also, on the 23rd of November, 1514, one Nicolaus de Bibiena superst. fontis S. Petri.—Vol. 554, on January 3, 1516: Hieron. de Albicis capit. balisterior.; on January 10, 1516: Barthol. de Bibiena superst. munit.—Vol. 555, on March 12, 1516: Barthol. de Ricasolis cancell. custodie S. D. N.; on March 28, 1516: Simon de Tornabonis commiss. gent. armor.—Vol. 557 (1517–1518), often: Barth. de Bibiena superst. munit. and Nicol. de Bibiena superst. fontis S. Petri.—Vol. 559, on November 30, 1519: Iulianus Tornabonus castellan. castris S. Angeli.

‡ PIEPER, Nuntiaturen, 48 seq.

§ RICHARD, 7 seqq.; BASCHET, Catherine de Médicis, 260.

Among the Swiss Nuncios, Gorio Gherio came from Pistoia and Antonio Pucci from Florence.\* Quite a new phenomenon is the fact that the resident Ambassadors of the Republic of Florence in France, Roberto Acciaiuoli, Francesco Vettori, and Francesco Pandolfini, acted provisionally for the Pope in conjunction with the ordinary Nuncios. In Spain also, the Florentine Ambassadors, Giovanni Corsi and Giovanni Vespucci, were employed by the Holy See.† On certain important occasions the Pope employed some of his relatives on diplomatic missions; thus Roberto Orsini was sent first to Hungary, and then to treat with the German Electors about the imperial election; and Raffaello de' Medici was Nuncio to Charles V. from October, 1516, until the spring of 1517, and again from August, 1519, until April, 1521.‡

The relatives of the Pope were very numerous. Of those nearest to him, his nephew Lorenzo, the son of his brother Giuliano, and his cousin Giulio, there is only too much to be told in the history of his Pontificate. Lorenzo's ambitious mother, Alfonsina Orsini, must also be frequently mentioned. Giuliano died in 1516, Lorenzo in 1519,§ and Alfonsina in 1520.|| The only daughter of the latter married Filippo Strozzi, and devoted herself to the care of Lorenzo's orphan child, the little Duchess Caterina de' Medici.

Leo X. had many relatives through his three sisters,

\* Archiv für schweiz. Gesch., XVI., xx., xxiii. *seqq.*

† PIEPER, *loc. cit.*, 56, 58, 59.

‡ *Ibid.*, 53, 54, 60, and Vol. VII. of this work, pp. 216, 278, 418 n.

§ Cf. Vol. VII. of this work, pp. 150 and 281.

|| Cf. BASCHET, Catherine de Médicis, 263; Arch. stor. Ital., 5th Series, XXIV., 19 *seqq.* MORSOLIN, in Riv. Ital. di numismatica, V. (1892), 71 *seqq.*



Maddalena, Lucrezia, and Contessina. Maddalena\* had married the wealthy Franceschetto Cibo, Count of Anguillara, who died in 1519, having been made by the Pope Governor of Spoleto. She had six children by her marriage. The eldest son, Innocenzo (born 1491), was made a Cardinal in 1513: he led a completely worldly life, and left a bad reputation behind him.† Maddalena's second son, Lorenzo, married, in 1515, Ricciarda Malaspina, the heiress of Massa and Carrara. The third son, Giovanni Battista, was made Bishop of Marseilles by Clement VII. when his brother Innocenzo resigned the see. Maddalena's daughter, Caterina (born 1501), married Giovan Maria da Varano of Camerino. Leo created him Duke in 1515, gave him Sinigaglia in 1520, and, after the death of Lorenzo de' Medici, made him Prefect of Rome.‡ Roberto di Sanseverino, Count of Cajazzo, the husband of Maddalena's second daughter Ippolita, received from the Pope, Colorno, in the territory of Parma. A third daughter, Eleonora, entered a cloister in Genoa.§

Lucrezia de' Medici had married Jacopo Salviati, who tried to come to the aid of Leo X. in his financial difficulties without neglecting his own interests. Their son Giovanni

\* Maddalena, who received the right of Roman citizenship in 1515 (GREGOROVIVS, *Schriften*, I., 289), died on December 2, 1519. Outwardly the Pope showed no signs of mourning, though her loss grieved him very much. Paris de Grassis in HOFFMANN, 434.

† Cf. STAFFETTI, 25 *seq.*, 33 *seqq.*

‡ Cf. Regest Leonis X., n. 15,241; MESTICA, Favorino, 39, 43 *seq.*, *Giorn. d. lett. Ital.*, XIII., 408 *seqq.*; Paris de Grassis in HOFFMANN, 451 *seq.*; BALAN, Boschetti, I., 172; FELICIANGELI, *Not. s. vita di Cat. Cibo-Varano, duchessa di Camerino*, Camerino, 1891. The \*announcement of the appointment of G. Maria da Varano as Prefect of the City, dated August 8, 1520, is in the State Archives, Florence, Urb. eccl.

§ Cf. STAFFETTI, 33.

was made protonotary at an early age, Bishop of Fermo in 1516, and Cardinal in 1517.\* The red hat was also given to Niccolò Ridolfi, the son of the Pope's third sister Contessina, who died in 1515,† and of Piero Ridolfi,‡ who was made Governor of Spoleto from 1514 to 1516;§ at the same time as the Pope's two nephews, Luigi de' Rossi received the purple. He was related to Leo through his mother, who was a natural sister of Lorenzo the Magnificent, and had been brought up with Leo. His early death was a great grief to the Pope.||

Leo's friendship with Cardinal Bibbiena was unusually close.¶ This highly-gifted man was second to no member

\* Cf. MORONI, LXI., 8.

† Cf. SANUTO, XX., 362. For the money given to Contessina, 1514, see Div. Cam., 63, f. 264b, Secret Archives of the Vatican. In the \*Inventarium mentioned, *supra*, p. 93, n., it is said: Asserunt habere Contessinam or Maddalenam. Both sisters, therefore, made as much use as possible of their brother's position.

‡ A daughter of Ridolfi married the Lord of Piombino in 1514; see \*Letter of Cardinal Medici to Lorenzo, March 16, 1513 (State Archives, Florence, Av. il princ., CXIII.); SANUTO, XVIII., 470; BASCHET, Catherine de Médicis, 243. About the marriage of Luigi Ridolfi (1516), see Carte. Stroz., I., 27.

§ When he was there Ridolfi commissioned Spagna to paint for him the Madonna, so famed for its beauty and dignity, which is now the ornament of the Palazzo Pubblico at Spoleto.

|| Castiglione reports to the Marchioness of Mantua, Isabella (Aug. 17, 1519), that Cardinal Rossi was dangerously ill (gotta, flusso e febre). \*N. S<sup>re</sup> ne ha sentito e tutta via sente grandissimo despiacere, pur bisogna concordarsi con la volonta di Dio. Rossi, died on Aug. 19, to the great grief of the Pope; see Report in BASCHET, 261-262, and the \*Letters of Castiglione, Aug. 17, 19, 27, in Appendix, Nos. 12-14.

¶ The old biography by Bandini (Livorno, 1758) is now of course insufficient; G. Grimaldi has undertaken the praiseworthy task of writing a monograph of Bibbiena. There is much that is new about him in LUZIO-RENIER, Mantua, 195 *seqq.*, 208 *seqq.*, 224 *seqq.*, 245

of the Court in amiability, gaiety, wit, and high spirits ; while frequent mention has been made of the part he played as an astute politician and—for a time—chief adviser to the Pope. Even later, when Cardinal Medici had taken his place, his friendship remained most valuable to Leo, who entrusted him with many secrets of state policy. He lived in the Vatican, so as to be near his master. In the spring of 1516 Bibbiena was selected to be Legate to the Emperor, and two years later he was sent in the same capacity to the Court of Francis I.\* During his tenure of this last office his relations with Francis I. were such that it was evident that he had more regard for the interests of France than befitted his position. Consequently, his friendship with the Pope became strained, and he was recalled to Rome in 1520 ; he died there on the 9th of November of the same year. The rumour that he had been poisoned, which was spread about, was entirely without foundation ; for the Cardinal had been in failing health for years.†

It is not easy to form a just estimate of Bibbiena's personality, so mixed are good and evil in him. The authorship of the comedy "Calandria," which is full of indecent

*seqq.*, 321 *seqq.*, 330. See also *Giorn. d. lett. Ital.*, XXXIX., 207 *seqq.*, 217 *seqq.*, 226 *seqq.*, and RICHARD, 7 *seqq.*, 322 *seqq.*, 329 *seqq.*, 353. *seqq.*

\* See Vol. VII. of this work, 152 *seq.*, 237 *seq.*, 240 *seq.* In the autumn of 1516 Bibbiena was sent as Legate to Perugia and Spoleto ; see the \*Bull of Nomination, dat. 1516, XV., Kal., Sept., A, 4º, Regest. 1196, f. 204, in the Secret Archives of the Vatican.

† Cf. Paris de Grassis in HOFFMANN, 456 ; BANDINI, 50 *seqq.* ; CIAN, *Decennio di Bembo*, 9, n. 1, and Cortegiano, xix. ; see also LUZIO-RENIER, *Mantova*, 246 *seqq.*, and *Giorn. d. lett. Ital.*, XXXIX., 227 *seq.* In addition to this I may remark that ever since 1513 Bibbiena had been subject to attacks of illness ; see SANUTO, XVII., 205 ; (BANDINI, 16), XXIII., 288 ; *Miscell. di stor. Ital.*, II., 130. It seems that Bibbiena had an incurable disease of the stomach.

jokes, is not compatible with his position as a prince of the Church. Moreover, the erotic paintings in his bathroom,\* and many of his letters,† prove that Bibbiena was more worldly-minded than beseemed his position. Leo X., like many of his contemporaries, took no notice of Bibbiena's lax manner of life. In fact the bewitching amiability of the clever and refined Tuscan,‡ his intellectual tastes, his knowledge of classical literature, his ability as a statesman and companion, and his skill as an organizer of festivities and entertainments,§ made this friend of his youth quite indispensable to the Medici Pope. No less useful was Bibbiena to his master in matters of art; for the Cardinal was a good connoisseur in such things. His ardent appreciation of art, and especially the terms of friendship on which he was with Raphael,|| weighs

\* By Bibbiena's desire there was represented on these walls the story of Venus and Cupid—a most unseemly subject for a Cardinal's palace. Raphael drew the sketches for this. *Cf.* PASSAVANTI, II., 277 *seqq.*; HASSE in the *Zeitschr. f. bild. Kunst*, VI., 137 *seq.* (suppl., *Kunstchronik*, 1896, No. 33), and DOLLMAYR in *Arch. stor. d. Arte*, III., 272 *seqq.* The statement, which is repeated even by GSELL-FELS, 4, 592, that the frescoes on the wall are now hidden by a partition, is incorrect. The bathroom is indeed inaccessible, but I can testify, from the most authentic information, that the frescoes are still to be seen, though they are in a most deplorable condition. The chief painting on the right-hand wall is completely destroyed where a cupboard was set up, for the bathroom served as a dining-room. See also LANCIANI, I., 211.

† With the frivolous letters in MOLINI, I., 79, 80, 86, *cf.* LUZIO-RENIER, Mantova, 225 *seq.*; see also BUSER, *Beziehungen*, 338.

‡ *Amabilissimus homo* (BEMBO, *Hist. Venet.*, Basil., 1557, 537).

§ He was essentially a "maitre de plaisir"; *cf.* JOVIUS, *Vita.*, lib. 4, and *Vita Anonyma* in ROSCOE-BOSSI, V., 156 *seq.*

|| *Cf.* LUZIO-RENIER, Mantova, 240, and the literature there given also *l'Arte*, 1899, 259. The portrait of Bibbiena cannot be authenticated with any certainty. CIAN (Cortegiano, 43) believes that it must be the well-known portrait of a Cardinal in the Pitti Gallery.



in the balance in his favour. Moreover, in spite of his frivolity, Bibbiena had a worthier and more serious side. This is shown, among other things, by his intimate friendship with such excellent men as Castiglione, Giulio Sadoletto, and Giovanni Battista Sanga,\* as well as by his last testament.†

Next to Bibbiena, the Pope made his friends among the younger Cardinals to whom he owed his elevation, his friendship being given especially to Luigi d'Aragona, Alfonso Petrucci, Soderini, Sauli, Ippolito d'Este, Sigismondo Gonzaga, and Marco Cornaro.‡ To them were joined the newly-made Cardinals, Cibo and Pucci.§ Most

\* Cf. BANDINI, 24 *seqq.* ; Giorn. d. lett. Ital., XXVII., 293.

† BANDINI (50 *seq.*) has made known to us Bibbiena's last testament, dated November 8, 1520 ; MANUCCI, *Glor. del Casent.*, I. Cf. MAZZATINTI, VI., 182, about the MS in the Library of the Confrat. di S. Maria at Arezzo. The Marchese Ferrajoli possesses \*Hippolytus de Cesis (cam. apost. not.), *Instrument.*, 1511-1522. Here, on p. 277 *seqq.*, we find the Testamentum Card<sup>lis</sup> S. Mariae in porticu. In this Bibbiena provides for masses for the repose of his soul ; he leaves legacies to certain cloisters where prayers will be said for him ; and he leaves a hundred and fifty ducats "pro maritandis puellis pauperibus in terra Bibiene." The following provisions are interesting : "Item reliquit rev. Card. de Cybo unum pannum quadratum sericeum auro pretextum b. Veronice quo utebatur ipse testator ante altare in celebratione misse. Item reliquit aliud quadrum pannum pictum manu Raphaelis cum figura b. Virginis, quo ipse testator in eius cubiculo utebatur, mag. dom. Balth. de Castiliono. Item reliquit rev. dom. P. Bembo S. D. N. secretario quandam parvam lunam auream. Item reliquit quod pax magna S. D. N<sup>o</sup> et unum collare aureum cum certis gemmis et etiam si S<sup>ti</sup> Sue placebit quedam crux, alias per S. Suam sibi et dom. Balth. Stuerdo communiter largita restituatur."

‡ Cf. SANUTO, XVI., 54, XVII., 217, 486, and BASCHET, *Cath. de Médicis*, 241. Cf. LUZIO, *Isabella d'Este*, 92.

§ SANUTO, XX., 193, where Pucci is named Palatine Cardinal together with Medici and Bibbiena.

of those mentioned were lovers and promoters of art and literature, and some few among them were learned;\* but they were all thoroughly worldly-minded, and many of them—true children of a corrupt age—led scandalous lives. Their days were spent in wild sport, luxurious carouses, frivolous dramas, and other worse things. Intercourse with these extravagant young men could not fail to have a bad effect on one so inclined to pleasure as Leo X.†

In the catastrophe of 1517 the Pope's friendship with Petrucci, Soderini, and Sauli came to a terrible end. Luigi d'Aragona, who was without cause suspected of a share in Petrucci's conspiracy, thought it advisable to absent himself from the Court for some time under pretext of a visit to Charles V.; however, after his return to Rome in the spring of 1518, his former relations with the Pope were restored. Luigi d'Aragona, who was perhaps the best among the younger Cardinals, died in January, 1519.‡ Ippolito d'Este, the patron of Ariosto, retired to Ferrara, where he died in September, 1520. Cornaro, who also had unjustly fallen under suspicion, continued, together with Pucci, to enjoy the confidence of the Pope; but how much further the Pope's good-will extended is shown by the large creation of Cardinals on the 1st of July, 1517.

\* Soderini was versed in Etruscan inscriptions; see *Arch. stor. Ital.*, 4th Series, XIX., 314.

† So says JOVIUS, *Vita*, lib. 4. As to the Cardinals in general, *cf.* ALBÈRI, 2nd Series, III., 55 *seqq.*, 59 *seq.* The reputation in which some of them were held is shown by the numerous pasquinades upon them; *cf.* CESAREO in the *Nuova Rassegna*, 1894, I., 68 *seqq.*; ROSSI, *Pasquinate XLII. seqq.*, XLVIII., XLIX., etc.; *Giorn. d. lett. Ital.*, XXVIII., 49. Cibo and Sigismondo Gonzaga suffered from the *morbus gallicus*; see ALBÈRI, 2nd Series, III., 58. As to the large incomes of the Cardinals, *cf.* FABRONIUS, 127, 287.

‡ See PASTOR, *Die Reise des Kardinals L. d'Aragona*, 7 *seqq.*

Among those who were then raised to the purple, Ponzetti, Armellini, Passerini, Pandolfini, Orsini, Salviati, Ridolfi, Rangoni, and, above all others, Luigi de' Rossi, were the intimate friends of Leo X.\*

Literature and art were patronized to no less a degree by a number of other prelates, among whom may be distinguished Baldassare Turini da Pescia, Gian Maria Giberti, Giovanni Battista Branconio dell' Aquila, and Giannozzo Pandolfini, both of whom were friends of Raphael's; † the Frenchmen, Ferry de Carondelet ‡ and Thomas le Roy, who built the exquisite Farnesina ai Baullari; § and also the German-Luxemburger, Goritz. Turini's villa, now the Villa Lante, decorated by Giulio Romano, and situated on the Janiculum with the finest

\* About those nominated, *cf.* Vol. VII. of this work, 201 *seqq.*

† Raphael painted for the former the Visitation, now in Madrid, and drew the plans for his palace in the Borgo; see MÜNTZ, Raphael, 430. About G. Pandolfini, Bishop of Troia between 1484 and 1514, who died in 1525, see UGHELLI, I., 1343. *Cf.* ROSSI, Pasquinate, 142. His palace in the Via di Sangallo in Florence, built by Francesco di Sangallo from a sketch of Raphael's, is an extremely graceful building, half palace, half villa; *cf.* CLAUSSE, III., 126 *seqq.*; GEYMÜLLER, *Raff. come architett.*, 54 *seqq.* Geymüller is preparing a monograph about the Palazzo Pandolfini. Pandolfini lived for some time in the Vatican during the reign of Leo X.; see SANUTO, XXXII., 465.

‡ The Duke of Grafton possesses a beautiful portrait of Ferry de Carondelet and his secretary by Sebastiano del Piombo. *Lettres de Ferry de Carondelet*, published by L. de la Brière, Evreux, 1894.

§ About Thomas le Roy, commonly called Regis, and his palace, recently and not very happily restored, *cf.* GNOLI in *Arch. stor. d. Arte*, 1889, 393 *seqq.*; and *Riv. d. Italia*, 1900, I., 530 *seqq.*; *Giorn. Arcadico*, VIII., 401 *seq.*; SCHULTZ in the *Zentralblatt der Bauverwaltung*, 1891, No. 17; *Kunstchronik*, 1901-1902, 125, 266; TOMASETTI in the *Bull. d. commiss. archeol.*, 1900, 321 *seqq.*, and *Cosmos catholicus*, 1901, No. 6; CLAUSSE, *S. Gallo*, II., 169 *seqq.*; GATTI in *Studi e docum.*, 1904, 275 *seqq.*; and especially MOLLAT in the *Annal. de St. Louis des Français* VI., 159 *seqq.* See also LANCIANI, II., 10 *seq.*

panoramic view of Rome,\* was, together with the vineyard belonging to the affable old Goritz, the central resort of the humanists inhabiting Rome.† Turini, who like Giberti and Pandolfini was the confidant of the Medici, was intimate with Francia, Leonardo da Vinci, and especially with Raphael, and was one of his executors. His correspondence with Lorenzo de' Medici and Lorenzo Gheri‡ shows him to us as a connoisseur of art and patron of artists.

Whereas the Roman nobles were, with few exceptions, distinguished neither socially nor as patrons of learning,§ the great bankers, the monied aristocracy, brought a remarkable and new element into Roman society. Their most brilliant representative was Agostino Chigi, the Rothschild of his time. His intimacy with Julius II.|| had been troubled during the latter years of the impetuous Rovere; but, on the other hand, his relations with Leo X. remained to the end the very best possible.¶

\* The fine tomb of Turini (ob. 1543, see State Archives, Florence, Av. il. princ., CVII., introductory remarks), in the Cathedral of Pescia, which owed a great deal to his son, was designed by Raffaello da Montelupo. Of the frescoes in the Villa Lante, only fragments remain. Cf. Strena Helbigiana, Lipsiae, 1900, 129 seq., 299 seq.

† Cf. *infra*, pp. 189, 216.

‡ Printed in GAYE, I., 138 seqq., 148 seqq.; cf. JANITSCHKE, Gesellschaft, 95.

§ Marc Antonio Altieri draws a moving, though most likely exaggerated, picture in his *Nuptiali*, finished about 1514 (ed. Narducci, Roma, 1873, cf. especially p. 15), of the impoverishment, largely by their own fault, and disappearance of the Roman families of highest standing.

|| Cf. Vol. VI. of this work, p. 495.

¶ The principal Life of the great banker, by Fabio Chigi, which is for the most part based on Tizio,\* Hist. Senen, has been published by CUGNONI in Arch. d. Soc. Rom., II., 46 seqq., with many valuable notes (II., 37 seqq., 209 seqq., 475 seqq.; III., 213 seqq., 291 seqq., 422



By his extensive financial operations, Chigi, whose bank was in the Via de' Banchi, had amassed an almost fabulous fortune. Well-informed contemporaries estimated his annual income at 70,000 ducats. He left 800,000 behind him when he died. He himself once told the Pope that he possessed a hundred houses and as many ships, and that he employed 20,000 men. But this was not the only test of his fortune, for the mere word of such a Cræsus was as good as solid money. The sovereigns of Spain, France, Germany, and even the Sultan, laid themselves out to win the favour of Chigi by their gifts. The proud Venetians, to whom he lent 125,000 ducats in 1511, gave him the place of honour next to the Doge when he visited their city. Leo treated this prince of bankers, whose assistance he so often sought, like a crowned head. Chigi often had the honour of receiving the Pope as his guest in his famous country-house, the Farnesina, which was full of every kind of work of art.\* The luxury of the merchant prince, who used nothing but silver plate in his house, to the exclusion of earthenware, reminds us of that of the ancient Roman Emperors. At one of his extravagant banquets, which was spread in the loggia overlooking the Tiber, the gold and silver dishes which had been used were thrown after each course into the river—whence, no doubt, they were drawn up afterwards in hidden nets. At another banquet, given in honour of Chigi's birthday, each guest *seqq.*; IV., 56 *seqq.*, 195 *seqq.*). It is surprising that no one should have undertaken the grateful task of writing a full biography of this man, who is so characteristic of his time. Of later lives, *cf.* REUMONT in *Zahns Jahrb. f. Kunstwissenschaft*, I., 213 *seqq.*, and especially FÖRSTER, *Farnesina-Studien*, I *seqq.*

\* He entertained the Pope at the end of April, 1513; SANUTO, XVI., 227. Leo X. sometimes dined also with Card. Farnese; see \*Letter of Castiglione from Rome, July 4, 1519. Gonzaga Archives, Mantua.

found the plate laid in front of him engraved with his own arms.

When, by the persuasion of the Pope, Chigi decided to marry his mistress, a great feast was held at the Farnesina. The Pope himself—which is characteristic of the moral tone of the time—took part in it with thirteen Cardinals. He even held the finger of the bride while the marriage ring was being placed on it. On this occasion Chigi, at terrific expense, sent to all parts of the world for the choicest viands. Among other luxuries he had live fish sent from France and Spain, and even from the coasts of the Bosphorus.\* Such extravagance, which bears the mark of the *parvenu*, has something repulsive about it.

Chigi has better claims to remembrance on account of his great benevolence and generous patronage of art and literature; the name of “il magnifico” was given to him on account of his generosity in regard to these. Though not himself a man of any great culture, he gladly promoted learning of every kind. For this purpose he had a printing-press set up in one of his houses, at which was produced an edition of Pindar, the first Greek book to appear in print in Rome. Among the learned and literati, Giovio, Bembo, Cornelio Benigno, and Aretino were closely connected by friendship with the wealthy merchant.† As a patron of art Chigi vied even with Leo X. That this is no exaggeration is shown by a glance at the Farnesina, that “ideal dwelling-place, half town-mansion and half country-house.” The dwelling-rooms on the upper floor are decorated with architectural paintings by Baldassare Peruzzi. In the sleeping-chamber Soddoma painted the

\* With SANUTO, XXV., 386, and XXVII., 628, *cf.* Arch. d. Soc. Rom., II., 66 *seqq.*, III. 232, 290; FÖRSTER, 7 *seq.*; JANSEN, Soddoma, 107; Giorn. d. lett. Ital., XXXIX., 205.

† *Cf.* FÖRSTER, 5 and 118.

Marriage of Alexander with Roxana, and the family of Darius before the conqueror of the world. On the ground-floor in the great hall, which was originally open, Chigi had painted the fable of Psyche and Cupid, after the popular narrative of Apuleius. Raphael designed the decorations of the ceiling, beams, and cornices, which were carried out by Giulio Romano and G. Francesco Penni. The beautiful encircling wreaths are the work of Giovanni da Udine. In the adjoining hall Baldassare Peruzzi painted the starry heavens on the ceiling, while in the lunettes are subjects from Ovid's "Metamorphoses," by Sebastiano del Piombo. On the entrance wall Raphael himself painted the Triumph of Galatea, which furnishes a proof of how well he could adapt himself to the reproduction of the sensuous world of the antique. But in the case of this work of art, as in that of the story of Psyche, the Christian critic can give only a qualified admiration to the prevalent "divine nudity." \*

From these works he will turn with alacrity to others for which Chigi is equally responsible, in the Church of S. Maria della Pace and the chapel in S. Maria del Popolo. For the first Raphael painted his incomparable Sybils.† In the mortuary chapel of the Chigi in S. Maria del Popolo, Sebastiano del Piombo painted the Nativity of

\* According to Vasari, B. Peruzzi was the architect of the Farnesina, according to Geymüller, it was Raphael, but SPRINGER (Beibl. z. Zeitschr. f. bild. Kunst., 1884, 408) does not feel at all sure about this. As to the ornamentation, cf. GRUYER in the Gaz. d. Beaux Arts, 1862; SPRINGER, Raffael, 260 *seq.*, 338 *seq.*; MÜNTZ, 509 *seqq.*, 519 *seqq.*; MINGHETTI, 141 *seqq.*, 203 *seqq.*; FÖRSTER, 39 *seq.*, and Repert., XXIII., 1 *seq.*; MICHAELIS in the Kunstchronik, 1889, No. 1; PROPPING, Sebastian del Piombo, Leipzig, 1892, 28 *seq.*; MAASS, Aus der Farnesina, Marburg, 1902, and the inspired description of STEINMANN, 171 *seq.*; see also his Sixtina, II., 104 *seq.*

† Cf. Springer, 258 *seq.*; MÜNTZ, 511 *seqq.*

Mary as an altar-piece, and Raphael sketched the architectural designs for the chapel, the bronze-relief of Christ and the woman of Samaria, the statue of Jonas, and the mosaic paintings for the cupola. In this last are represented the gods of the planets and the heaven of the fixed stars, watched over and guided by angels, while from above they are blessed by God the Father.\* Chigi, who was very generous in ecclesiastical matters, gave the commission for the decoration of another church. In the Church of the Guardian Angels, belonging to the Sienese confraternity of S. Caterina, he had the altar-piece, our Lord's Resurrection, painted by Genga. At Tolfa he built a church for the hermits of St. Augustine.†

Chigi survived his friend Raphael by only a few days. He died on the 10th of April, 1520, at the comparatively early age of fifty-five, and was buried with regal splendour in the chapel which he had prepared for himself in S. Maria del Popolo.‡

The other bankers in Rome, the Spannochi, Strozzi, Altoviti, Gaddi,§ and Bini,|| could not compare with Chigi either in riches or generosity, any more than could the agents of the houses of Fugger and Welser ; nevertheless, they were his rivals in the patronage of art.¶ The young

\* With MÜNTZ (514 *seqq.*) *cf.* GRUNER, I mosaici nella cappella Chigiana, Roma, 1859.

† JANITSCHKE, Gesellschaft, 96, and FÖRSTER, 5 *seq.*

‡ With SANUTO, XXVIII., 361, 385, 406, 407, 423, 424, 425, 426, and Tizio in FABRONIUS, 313, *cf.*, in Appendix, No. 17, the \*Letter of Ang. Germanello, April 11, 1520. Gonzaga Archives, Mantua.

§ The fine palace of the Gaddi, in the Via de' Banchi, was built by Jacopo Sansovino ; VASARI, VII., 497.

|| The palace of the Bini in the Via Consolato was unfortunately destroyed in 1888 ; see Arch. d. Arte, I., 268 *seqq.*

¶ *Cf.* the detailed notice in SCHULTE, I., 201 *seq.*, about the houses of Fugger and Welser.



Bindo Altoviti came first in this; his portrait in the Pinacoteca at Munich was for a long time described as a portrait of Raphael by himself,\* in spite of the blue eyes and fair, curly hair. As well as this wonderful portrait, Raphael painted for Altoviti the Madonna dell' Impannata, now in the Pitti Gallery.† The grave Michael Angelo, who kept aloof from the worldly Chigi, held Altoviti in such friendship that he gave him a cartoon of his Sistine frescoes, and commemorated his noble friend by a medal. His bust was made by Benvenuto Cellini.‡ These and other works of art, combined with choice antique specimens, were the glory of the Palazzo Altoviti, which stood close to the banks of the Tiber, to the left of the Ponte S. Angelo. The palace disappeared in 1888,§ while the offices of the mercantile house of Chigi, which stood close by, are used at present as a wood magazine.|| Nowhere is the transitoriness of human things brought home more forcibly than in the Eternal City.

Another banker, Lorenzo Strozzi—the brother of Filippo, so well known for his epicureanism¶—tried to outrival

\* H. GRIMM has contested this untenable opinion in the *preuss. Jahrb.*, XXIV. About the picture, *cf.* HIRTH-MUTHER, *Cicerone in der ält. Pinakothek, München, 1888, 77.*

† MÜNTZ, *Raphael*, 531, 533.

‡ See PLON, 221 *seq.*

§ *Cf.* GNOLI in the *Arch. d. Arte*, I., 202 *seqq.* About Altoviti, *cf.* ALVERI, *Roma*, 107 *seq.*; PANCINI, *Genealogia e storia della famiglia Altoviti, Firenze, 1871, 55 seqq.* See also MORENI, *Illustraz. di una rarissima medaglia rappres. B. Altoviti, opera di M. A. Buonarotti, Firenze, 1824; cf. LANCIANI, I., 163.*

|| Earlier than this they were used as stables. They are situated in the Arco de' Banchi (formerly known as the Cortile de' Chigi), Nos. 9 and 10, which connects the Via de' Banchi with the Via Paola; see *Arch. d. Soc. Rom.*, II., 488, and *Arch. d. Arte*, I., 192 *seqq.*

¶ *Cf.* FERRAI, *Lorenzo de' Medici, Milano, 1889, 8-9; and CIAN, Cortegiano, 101 seq.*

Chigi in extravagance. A banquet given by him during the Carnival of 1519 caused him to be much talked about. His shuddering guests were first led up a step to a black door, through which they entered a hall draped in black. In the middle of this stood a black table on which were flasks of wine and two deaths'-heads containing the choicest viands. After this whimsical introduction the guests adjourned to a brilliantly-lighted hall and sat down to table. The food was served up by means of an underground contrivance: first there were handed dainties, and after them uneatable food. Suddenly the lights went out, and there entered two actors dressed like jesters, who led a dance. The meal was so plentiful that the guests had eaten to surfeit before a third course was offered to them. Fourteen persons took part in this banquet, including Cardinals Rossi, Cibo, Salviati, and Ridolfi, the two buffoons Mariano and Brandino, and three ladies of the demi-monde.\*

Such a banquet takes us back to a time when wealth and luxury, extravagance and laxity of morals, had reached an ominous height. The fact that Strozzi dared to invite such company to meet the Cardinals, is most significant. But such a thing was nothing new in Rome. Even in the time of the rugged Julius II., to say nothing of the reign of Alexander VI., a well-known prostitute, the beautiful and highly-cultivated Imperia, played a part in high Roman society.†

There is but too much evidence as to the immorality which prevailed in Rome in the time of Leo X.‡ It

\* Cf. SANUTO, XXVII., 74-75.

† Cf. Vol. V. of this work, p. 123 *seq.*; see also GRAF, 264 *seq.*

‡ See Censimento d. città di Roma sotto Leone X., ed. Armellini, Roma, 1882, for the number of courtesans in Rome, the headquarters of whom were in the vicinity of the Ponte Sisto (see GRAF, 253). Cf.

extended to every branch of society, spiritual and secular, and reached its greatest development among the most highly educated. Yet the Rome of that time was not more corrupt than Venice or the other cities of Italy.\* The indifference with which even the highest spiritual authorities regarded the state of society at that time, and for some time after, is truly scandalous. The Popes of the time of the Catholic reformation were the first to combat with severity and decision an evil which caused such grave scandal, especially in the capital of the Christian world. The immorality in Rome was connected with her vast intercourse with foreigners;† with the idleness of many of her prelates, who spent the large incomes arising from their benefices in the metropolis of the world; with the increase of luxury;‡ with the enormous influx of money; with the settlement of so many foreigners in Rome;§ and especially with the growth of population.||

the Lamentations of Batt. Mantovano about the morals of the Curia in BURCKHARDT, II.<sup>7</sup>, 304. The satires, pasquinades, and general literature of the time are fully quoted by GRAF, 226 *seqq.*, 285. See also BURCKHARDT, I.<sup>7</sup>, 320; II., 332. To the reign of Leo X. belongs the rare "Lamento di pasquino" (*s.d.*, but after the battle of Bicocca), a copy of which is in the State Library, Munich, Poet. Ital., 517.

\* Cf. Vol. V. of this work, 164 *seq.*

† PARIS DE GRASSIS (\*Diarium, in the Secret Archives of the Vatican) puts the number of those present at the paschal blessing in 1517 at over a hundred thousand. These cannot (see GNOLI, Arch. d. Soc. Rom., XVII., 376) be counted as inhabitants, for assuredly there were many foreigners among them.

‡ Cf. ALTIERI, Nuptiali, 6 *seqq.*

§ The foreigners were the promoters of immorality in Rome; cf. BURCKHARDT, I.<sup>7</sup>, 200, who refers to DELICADO, Lozana, I., 239, for the laxity of moral conditions. The morals of the real inhabitants were better; see what ALTIERI (101 *seqq.*) says about the penalties of marriage separations.

|| Cf. *infra*, p. 128.

Rome still maintained her pre-eminently cosmopolitan character. There existed no court which was composed, racially and socially, of such heterogeneous elements; elements which formed to some extent rather ominous combinations. The facility with which persons could obtain money at the Curia as negotiators or go-betweens, and the rapidity with which promotion to spiritual offices could lead to power and wealth, were bound to attract place-hunters, adventurers, and idlers.\* No doubt the influx of the humanists had a bad effect on the machinery of government; still the humanists were by no means the only persons to pursue the love of gain at the expense of others, and to the neglect of their own duties.† A deep-rooted corruption had taken possession of nearly all the officials, and a host of abuses had become common among them. The truly Italian art of procrastination in matters of business, the inordinate number of gratuities and exactions, had passed all bounds. Moreover, on all sides deeds were dishonestly manipulated, and even falsified, by the officials.‡

No wonder that there arose from all parts of Christendom the loudest complaints about the corruption and financial extortions of the Papal officials. It was even said that in

\* See HOFFMANN, *Gesch. d. päpstl. Kanzlei*, 43.

† Cf. HOFFMANN, *loc. cit.*, 45 *seq.*, 47 *seq.*, who justly remarks that the lack of qualification in the officials was manifest in their carelessness in making out Bulls and Registers. The Registers of Leo X. are the worst and most illegible of all.

‡ Sebastiano da Trevigi was burnt on the charge of falsification of Bulls and Petitions; see JOVIUS, *Vita*, lib. 4; CICOGNA, *Michiel*, 402; SANUTO, XXVII., 474; and the \*Brief for Ioh. Novello et vicario gen. episc. Feltren., *s.d.* (super falsificat. litt. apost. facta a Sebastiano de Federicis): *Brevia anni* 1518, Arm., XXXIX., t. 32, f. 234; *ibid.* for Ant. de Pocalera (facultat. contra. falsificat. litt. apost., D, 1518, Juni 21). Secret Archives of the Vatican.



Rome everything had its price.\* With biting irony, the satirist Ariosto describes the restless doings of the avaricious members of the secularized Curia :—

Quando la ruota, che non pur castiga  
Ision rio, si volge in mezzo a Roma  
L'anime a cruciar con lunga briga.

Their insatiable avarice was ready to sacrifice peace, happiness, and liberty for benefices and dignities. What signify five mitres on the head or a hundred followers on the way to the Vatican? That they call mere luck † :—

Io lo stimo miseria ; e son sì pazzo,  
Ch'io penso e dico, che in Roma famosa  
Il signor è più servo, che'l ragazzo.

---

\* SANUTO, XXVI., 510 ; Vita Anon. in Cod. Vat., 3920, in JANUS, 382, n.

† Satire to Galeazzo Ariosto, Parnaso Italiano, Vol. XXVII., 12, 18, Venezia, 1718.

## CHAPTER IV.

### MEDICEAN ROME.

HOWEVER blameworthy the worldliness of the Curia might be in itself, it, like the lavish expenditure of the Pope, conduced rather to the advantage of Rome than otherwise, by the impetus which it gave to the extraordinary development of the city. There was no place in the world where capital could be put out to better advantage, where riches and importance could be obtained more rapidly, or where fewer taxes were paid.\* Rome was exempt from the miseries of war; hence the influx of immigrants, especially from the heavily-burdened north of Italy. This was so considerable that Giovio speaks of a whole colony of these immigrants having established themselves in the neighbourhood of the Campo de' Fiori. The Pope encouraged this influx as much as he could. He was active in promoting the development of Rome,† and exerted himself a great deal in the maintenance of quiet and security in all the States of the Church, as well as in the Eternal City itself.‡

\* RANKE especially points this out (Päpste, I.<sup>6</sup>, 265).

† With JOVIUS, *Vita*, l. 4, *cf.* the enumeration of Leo's merits as regarded Rome with the discourse in VENUTI, 131 *seqq.* and 165.

‡ With JOVIUS, *loc. cit.*, *cf.* Bull. V., 712 *seqq.*, 737; Regest. Leonis X., n. 4590, 16,937; BEMBI, *Epist.*, III., 9; IV., 15, 18; V., 34; VI., 13; XV., 11, 28; \*Brief to the Bishop of Tivoli, Sept. 18, 1515 (Arm. XXXIX., t. 30, Secret Archives of the Vatican); Paris de Grassis, ed. DELICATI-ARPELLINI, 85; Fr. Novellus in the \*Cod. Barb., lat. 2273, f. 18 of the Vatican Library. Nevertheless, many acts of murder were

He regulated the importation as well as the price of food,\* promoted husbandry in the Campagna, busied himself with draining the Pontine Marshes,† protected all the benevolent institutions, especially the hospitals, of Rome,‡ and did much to improve the architecture of the city. The works of restoration begun by Julius II. in the Via Alessandrina, leading from the Castle of St. Angelo to the Vatican, were continued under Leo by Giuliano di Sangallo. In the northern part of the Campo Marzio, the fine design of the three streets converging on the Piazza del Popolo was begun in this Pontificate, to be finished under Clement VII. The Bull of November 2nd, 1516, which revived the projects of Sixtus IV. for widening and embellishing the streets, was of the greatest importance for Rome. It stirred up architectural activity to such an extent that many parts of the city acquired a totally new aspect.§

committed in the States of the Church as well as in Rome; see the Report of M. v. Watt, 1520, in the *Mitteil. des hist. Ver. f. St. Gallen*, XXV., 292.

\* Regest. Leonis X., n. 3730.

† Cf. *ibid.*, n. 5847 (see also GOTTLOB, *Cam. Apost.*, 122), 13, 189; *Manosc. Torrig.*, XXVI., 367; *TOURNON*, *Etud. statist.*, 219; *MARINI*, *Lettera*, 61; *Monografia d. città di Roma*, I., 326. For the promotion of drainage at Ravenna, see \*Brief of Sept. 5, 1514 (*State Archives, Modena*), Appendix, No. 3.

‡ Cf. Bull. V., 639 *seqq.*; Regest. Leonis X., n. 6964, 7143; *PERICOLI*, *L'osped. di S. Maria d. Consolazione*, Roma, 1879, 119; *MORICHINI*, 143. For the founding of the Hospital of S. Maria di Costantinopoli in 1515, see *Arch. d. Soc. Rom.*, XIII., 286. In 1520 Leo X. erected a convent as a refuge for penitents; see Bull. V., 742 *seq.*; *ibid.*, 739 *seqq.*, see Bull. for confirmation of the archiconfraternitas charitatis in Jan. 1520, founded by Card. Giulio de' Medici.

§ Bull. V., 655; *REUMONT*, III., 2, 452; Regest. Leonis X., n. 6922. About the Via Alessandrina or Via Leonis, besides *Paris de Grassis*, ed. *ARMELLINI-DELICATI*, 120; see \**Div. Cam.*, 65, f. 36-37, and *Arm. XXXIX*, t. 41, f. 14b-15 of the Secret Archives of the Vatican, and

Contemporaries were astonished to see Rome becoming each day more beautiful, while her prosperity grew with her beauty.\* “From day to day,” says an orator, “new buildings spring up in your midst, and new quarters spring into life along the Tiber, on the Janiculum, and around the Porta Flaminia (del Popolo).”† The Venetian Ambassador, writing in 1523, puts the number of houses built in Rome by northern Italians since the election of Leo X. at ten thousand.‡ This calculation may be as greatly exaggerated as is Giovio’s statement that the inhabitants of Rome had increased to eighty-five thousand during Leo’s Pontificate.§ But a considerable and extraordinary development of the city is beyond all question. Witness to this are the notes of Marc Antonio Altieri, a Roman who lamented the rapid change in the condition of things, as much as the undoubted increase of luxury. He told the Pope many painful truths. “Not only do we see fine and commodious houses springing up on all sides,” he writes, “but with them splendid palaces full of distinguished inhabitants, noted for the unwonted splendour of their appearance, and the numbers among them of young exquisites decked out with brilliant caps on their

\*Cod. Barb., lat. 2428, f. 2. About the Ripetta, *cf.* Arch. d. Soc. Rom., I., 92 *seq.* In the \*Diary of a Frenchman it is said: “En l’an 1518 par commendement du pape Leon X. fut commencé la strada de N. Dame de populo . . . et fut achevé en l’an 1519”; Cod. Barb., lat. 3552, f. 34<sup>b</sup> of the Vatican Library.

\* *Cf.* in Appendix, No. 6, the \*Letter of A. Gabbioneta, Jan. 14, 1517. Gonzaga Archives, Mantua.

† VENUTI, Oratio, 160 *seqq.*

‡ ALBÈRI, 2nd Series, III., 67.

§ JOVIUS, Vita, l. 4. As to the exaggerations in which Giovio was wont to indulge, see GNOLI in the Arch. d. Soc. Rom., XVII., 382 *seq.* The number of inhabitants could not at that time have been more than 50,000.



heads, and velvet slippers and shoes on their feet, and surrounded by many servants. Women no longer don their finery only on feast-days, but wear it every day; when they go abroad they are proudly adorned, spreading around them the perfume of sweet scents; and at home there is the revelry of dancing and music, for all the world as if each one of them was about to ascend a throne.”\* What a contrast was this age to the time of Eugenius IV., about sixty years before, when, as is related, the Florentines looked on the Romans as a people of cow-herds!

The Leonine city, the central part of which had already been remodelled, chiefly under Alexander VI., was, during Leo's Pontificate, the essentially ecclesiastical quarter of Rome. Here, under the shadow of the chief church, St. Peter's, and the chief fortress, St. Angelo, the greater number of Cardinals, prelates, and officials of the Court and the Curia dwelt. To the palaces already existing there was added one, begun by Cardinal Armellini, and later belonging to the Cesi family.† The largest piazza after St. Peter's was that of S. Giacomo Scossacavalli, better known as the Piazza of the Cardinal S. Clemente, near which stood the palace of Domenico della Rovere, now the palace of the Penitenzieri. In a magnificent building which, though now hidden and crowded up by houses, retains many traces of its former splendour, lived Cardinal Luigi d'Aragona, who vied with Leo X. both in magnificence and generosity.‡ Just opposite to him, on the other side of the Piazza, lived Cardinal Adriano Castellesi,§ in a still more beautiful

\* ALTIERI, *Nuptiali*, 17. About the luxury of the Roman women, see also GAYE, I., 608, and REUMONT, III., 2, 859.

† Cf. GREGOROVIVS, VII., 3rd ed., 676.

‡ Cf. PASTOR, *Die Reise des Kardinals Luigi d'Aragona*, 8.

§ See Vol. VI. of this work, p. 179.

palace, which was for a long time ascribed to Bramante. Where the palace of the Convertendi now stands, there then stood Raphael's elegant mansion.\* Cardinal Soderini lived next to Cardinal Adriano Castellesi. Near these stood the mansion of Giannantonio Battiferri of Urbino, the façade of which was embellished by Raphael with paintings and drawings. This memorial has vanished, but on the right or northern side of the Borgo Nuovo, there still exists the house of the court physician, Febo Brigotti,† and the palace designed by Raphael for the Papal surgeon, Giacomo da Brescia. On the left side of the street, adjoining Raphael's palace, stood the house of the Zoni, and the palace of Cardinal Accolti. Further on, near the Piazza of St. Peter's, could be seen the magnificent palace of Raphael's friend, Giovan Battista Branconio, destroyed when the Piazza Rusticucci was made.‡

In the part of Rome on the left bank of the Tiber the finest palace was the Cancelleria, and the largest the Palazzo di San Marco, now known as the Palazzo di Venezia. Soon there arose a palace of truly Roman proportions, which has immortalized the name of the Farnese.§ As originally planned, the façade of the palace

\* Built by Bramante and bought by Raphael in 1517, and inhabited by him until his death. Later buildings set up round it have destroyed its original form; see GNOLI in *Nuova Antologia*, 1887, fasc. 11; A. ROSSI in the *Arch. st. dell' Arte*, I. (1888), fasc. 2, p. 1 *seqq.*; BUONAROTTI, 3rd Series, III., 26 *seq.*; and GNOLI, *Arch. st. dell' Arte*, 7 *seqq.*, 228 *seqq.*, II., 145 *seqq.*

† Over the door of Brigotti's house (Borgo Nuovo, 106-107) is the inscription:

"Phœbus  
Brigotus medicus."

‡ GNOLI, *Nuova Antologia*, 3rd Series, XIV. (1888), 591 *seq.* Cf. *Arch. stor. dell' Arte*, I., 134 *seqq.*; and MÜNTZ, III., 542.

§ Cf. NAVENNE in the *Revue des deux Mondes*, 1895, Sept., 399

was intended to look towards the Via Giulia. This street, at that time the broadest and finest in the Eternal City, took the place of the present Corso. A chronicler of Perugia, writing in the time of Clement VII., says that there was to be found the flower of Rome. Next to it in the way of brilliancy came the Canale di Ponte (now the Via del Banco di Santo Spirito) and the Via de' Banchi, where stood the houses of business of the merchant princes and lesser bankers, mostly Florentines. In the neighbourhood Leo erected the national church of S. Giovanni de' Fiorentini for his compatriots.\*

The whole of the district of Ponte, as far as the Piazza Navona and the Campo de' Fiori, was the most thickly populated and most lively quarter of the city. In the first named, the market had been held ever since 1477; the Campo de' Fiori was the place of execution of criminals; there was to be seen the greatest number of taverns.†

During Leo's pontificate many northern Italians settled in this quarter and erected new buildings, many of which were remarkable for their beauty.‡ Not far from the University, which had been enlarged by Leo X., stood two new palaces which rivalled in magnificence the imposing Palazzo Cicciaporci built for Giulio Alteriori in 1521; these were the Palazzo Lante ai Capretari, built by Jacopo Sansovino, and the Palazzo Maccarani, which Giulio Romano built for the family of Cenci. The custom of *seqq.*; CLAUSSE, II., 67 *seqq.* Leo X. inspected the building in person; see Paris de Grassis, ed. DELICATI-ARMELLINI, 72; see also *Alt-preussische Monatschrift*, XXXIX., 400 *seq.*

\* Cf. SCHULTE, I., 209.

† Cf. GREGOROVIVS, VII., 3rd ed., 681, 685 *seq.* The \*Diary in Cod. Barb., lat. 3552, f. 33 (Vatican Library), mentions the "grande justice" carried out on a murderer in the Campo de' Fiori.

‡ JOVIUS, Vita Leonis X., lib. 4. The Piazza Lombarda is now called the Piazza Madama.

painting the façade added not a little to the beauty of the houses. About the same time stucco-work, busts and other plaster ornaments, became more common.\* The dark, gloomy aspect of mediæval Rome began generally to disappear. Obviously it was in the more beautiful and renovated parts of the city that the signs of the new era could be more clearly read. In the labyrinths of narrow streets which surrounded the foot of the Capitol, and in the thickly-populated district of the Trastevere, the mediæval character of the city was preserved for a long time. The houses there were for the most part small, with porticoes or open galleries on the first floor, which was reached by outside stone staircases.† Here and there among them were towers, of which that of the Anguillara is the only one remaining.‡ The Campo Marzio, which was no less thickly inhabited, presented in its irregularities a rare mixture of modern and mediæval buildings, palaces, and churches, in the midst of the bustle of commerce in which the most varied nationalities took part.

While the city itself was being ever more and more transformed, under Leo X., the monuments of antiquity were left more or less untouched. In spite of the increasing interest taken in the antique, the old pagan monuments still served as convenient quarries for marble and travertine; nevertheless, the demolitions of this sort remained inconsiderable. The zeal of antiquarians saved many works of

\* See REUMONT, III., 2, 423, 858. About the new palaces mentioned above, *cf.* LANCIANI, *Scavi*, I., 212; *cf.* GRILLI, *Pitture a graffito e chiaroscuro di Polidoro e Maturino sulle facciate delle case a Roma*, in the *Rassegna d'Arte*, V., 97 *seq.*

† *Cf.* GREGOROVIVS, VII., 3rd ed., 678 *seq.* When this description was written, many more of the old-fashioned houses existed than at present. A good specimen of the houses with open galleries is to be found in the Trastevere in the *Vicolo dell'Atleta*.

‡ *Cf.* Vol. IV. of this work, p. 148.



art and old inscriptions. The Colosseum suffered most, whereas the Baths of Diocletian and Constantine, with those of Caracalla, remained practically intact.\*

The silent world of ruins formed a striking contrast with the restless life of the modern Rome of that time. The uninhabited portions were far more extensive than those built over. The Pincio was for the most part garden-land; country-houses began to arise on the Quirinal, and there were but few dwelling-houses on the Viminal, Esquiline, and Cœlian hills. The venerable basilicas and other churches gave its character to this part of Rome. S. Maria Maggiore and the Lateran, and the buildings belonging to them, as yet untouched by later restorations, stood in imposing grandeur with their rows of ancient marble pillars and mosaic decorations. The gigantic halls of the Baths of Diocletian commanded a vast field of ruins, grand in their loneliness; while close to the Baths was a formal wood in which deer were kept.† Testaccio was waste land; the Aventine was sparsely inhabited; the Pyramid of Caius Cestus was buried in rubbish. With the exception of some venerable churches and convents, nothing was to be seen in the neighbourhood except fields and meadows. The site of the Forums of Augustus and Nerva was partly field and partly marsh, the memory of which is kept alive by the name Arco de' Pantani. The treasures of the Forum were buried under about thirty feet of rubbish and earth. The pillars of the Temple of Saturn were buried

\* See REUMONT, III., 2, 454 *seq.* But witness is borne by VENUTI (69) that the burning of marble to obtain lime was still going on under Leo X.

† This is mentioned by Franc. Janis da Tolmezzo in his report quoted *infra*, p. 135 n. EGGER (*Verzeichnis der architektonisch Handzeichnungen der Hofbibliothek*, Wein, 1903, 19) gives a ground-plan of the Baths of Diocletian, taken from the sketch-book of an Italian, 1514.

to their base, while those of the Temple of Vespasian were buried to half their height. The Arches of Septimus Severus and Titus were surrounded by mean buildings. The remaining open space of the Forum, on which a great part of Roman history had been played, served as a cattle-market (*Campo vaccino*), while scattered around were old churches and single houses.

On the Capitol, the Palace of the Senators, with its four metal-crowned corner towers of the time of Boniface VIII., bore quite a mediæval appearance, in spite of the slight alterations made by Nicholas V., to whom the Palace of the Conservatori owed its actual form.\* The south-eastern summit of the historic hill was waste ground in the time of Leo X. The Tarpeian rock was called *Monte Caprino*, from the goats which climbed about it.

The Palatine, with its world of ruins, was an indescribably romantic wilderness. On the south side, in the midst of weeds and creepers, stood the magnificent remains of the *Septizonium*. The other colossal ruins of the Palace of the Cæsars were equally overrun by a wild growth of vegetation. In every rift and fissure of the red-brown walls grew dark-green ivy; while everywhere there bloomed wild-roses and yellow broom. Laurel trees, dark cypresses and picturesque pines, stood all about; while, in the midst of this confusion of wild growth, vines had been cultivated on every favourable spot. Deep silence reigned in the halls whence, in days gone by, the Cæsars had controlled the fate of the world. No one but learned and artistic men, who had visited the neighbouring baths for the sake of the remnants of decoration left there, ever thought of visiting the Palace of the Cæsars.

What men of culture cared to visit in Rome, is told

\* Cf. HÜLSEN, *Bilder aus der Geschichte des Kapitols*, Rom., 1899, II *seq.*

us in the reports of some of the Venetians.\* The first thing that every stranger did on arriving in Rome was to visit St. Peter's, the mosaic façade of which met his eyes from afar. A large part of the old church was still standing. The great relics there, the head of St. Andrew, and the Santo Volto (Sudarium of St. Veronica), were shown only on great festivals, except by the personal permission of the Pope. A provisional choir had been put up, so that worship could be carried on in the central nave. Everywhere, however, could be seen signs that the venerable building was doomed to destruction.† The foundations of the new dome covered such an immense space that the beholders felt that their grandchildren would scarcely live to see the completion of the wonderful work.

Great architectural activity reigned at the Vatican and also at St. Angelo. The Loggie of the Cortile of St. Damasus were approaching completion. About three hundred Swiss, tall, fine men in white, green, and yellow uniforms, bearing halberds, guarded the entrance to the Pope's residence, which was fitted up with every conceivable luxury which a highly-developed civilization could supply. Even the Venetian Ambassadors, accustomed as they were to all that art could contrive in the way of magnificence, were

\* Besides the known reports of the Venetian Ambassadors in 1523, most likely written by Pesaro, in ALBÈRI, 2nd Series, III., 97 *seqq.*, see the interesting report of Franc. Janis da Tolmezzo, who visited Rome in February, 1519 (in FULIN, *Diarii Venez.*, Venice, 1881, 68 *seq.*). There are interesting things to be found in the very rare French publication: Dom Edme, XLI<sup>e</sup> abbé de Clairvaux. *Relation d'un voyage à Rome commencé le XXIII. du mois d'août 1520, et terminé le XIV. du mois d'avril 1521.* Publ. par Harmand, Troyes, 1850.

† In the narrative of the journey of the Abbat Edme, he says about S. Peter's: Qui étoit du tout ou a peu pres desolee et ruinee et est piteable chose de la veoir. Le pape Julle y avoit fait quelque peu de beau commencement, mais faulte de couverture yl se ruinoit fort.

astounded by the splendour and beauty of the Vatican, with which no royal palace in the world could be compared.

In addition to the paintings on the walls and ceilings, which proclaimed the zenith of art, there was a great profusion of tapestry, and embroideries in gold and silk. The furniture and the gold and silver plate were models of the most refined taste. The Pope's chairs were covered with crimson velvet, with silver knobs, and the arms of Leo X. worked in gold.\* Within the Vatican the greatest conceivable activity prevailed; the pressure of business was so great that even prelates in high position had to wait four or five hours before they could have access to Cardinal Medici. Often six hours passed before an audience could be obtained with the Pope himself;† for Leo's intimates among the Cardinals went frequently to the Vatican. Bembo wrote to Bibbiena on the 19th of July, 1517: "The rooms of His Holiness, which Raphael painted, are made incomparably beautiful by these paintings; but the greatest attraction in them is the sight of the Cardinals, who are nearly always walking to and fro in them."‡

However much the works of Raphael in the Vatican were admired by his contemporaries, they placed a still higher value on the great creations of Michael Angelo in

\* I have taken these details from the reports of the Venetian Ambassadors quoted above. A most interesting insight of the furniture of the Vatican is given in the *\*\*Inventarium omnium bonorum existentium in foraria S<sup>mi</sup> D. Leonis*, pp. X., *factum de mandato Sue Beatis per r. d. Philippum de Senis et Christophorum Barotium camerae apost. clericos die septima Septembris A<sup>o</sup> D, 1518, pont. sui anno sexto*. State Archives, Rome, Arch. camerale, Invent. busta, I.

† Cf. the report of the Abbot Edme, 62-63, quoted above.

‡ BEMBO, *Opere*, III., 14.



the Papal chapel.\* But the devotees of antiquity found their central attraction in the court of the Vatican Belvedere, where the masterpieces of sculpture—the Nile, the Tiber, Hercules, Ariadne, Venus, the world-renowned Apollo, and, lastly, the Laocoon, which was at that time more admired than any—stood in the midst of cypresses, laurels, and orange trees, amidst which played running fountains. Leo X. gave free access to this sanctuary of ancient art.† Finally, no one who went to the Vatican failed to visit the Pope's menagerie, in which there were several lions.‡

The pilgrimage to the seven churches, which no devout visitor to Rome failed to perform, had to be made in one day, and usually took about eight hours. As a rule the visits began at St. Paul's, with its famous ancient pillars.§ Thence the pilgrim went to St. Sebastian; admission to the adjacent catacombs was not easily obtained, on account of several strangers having become hopelessly lost in the underground passages. From these venerable sanctuaries the pilgrim went on to the basilica of the Lateran, extraordinarily rich in relics; in front of the church there then stood the statue of Marcus Aurelius. Thence he proceeded to the Church of Santa Croce, where Cardinal Carvajal was carrying on his great improvements. After this he visited S. Lorenzo fuori le mure, and S. Maria Maggiore, finishing

\* Cf., for contemporary opinion, Repert. f. Kunstwissenschaft, IX., 121.

† Cf. Vol. VI. of this work, 487 *seqq.* The Venetian report of 1523 expressly mentions the granting of this free access.

‡ According to Vasari, Giovanni da Udine painted a picture of the Papal menagerie in the Sala de' Palafrenieri. About the lions, see Archiv für ältere deutsche Geschichte, VII., 182.

§ For the following, cf. the accounts quoted above of Franc. Janis da Tolmezzo and Pietro Pesaro. Dom Edme made the pilgrimage in reversed order, and visited also the catacomb of St. Callixtus.

his pilgrimage by a visit to the tomb of St. Peter in his church.

Lovers of antiquity did not neglect a visit to the colossal statues of Monte Cavallo, or the collection in the Palace of the Conservatori, where were to be found the Warrior extracting a thorn from his foot, and the She-wolf, which the Venetian Ambassador, Pietro Pesaro, calls the finest bronzes in the world. Among the principal ancient buildings, the same authority specially mentions the Pantheon, reached by eight steps, and the Baths of Diocletian. These last, which were then in a better state of preservation than at present, are, he says, among the finest buildings in Rome: yet the Colosseum surpasses all. The enthusiasm for antiquity which pervades Pesaro's report is not so conspicuous in the accounts of foreign travellers, which is a proof of the finely-cultivated taste of the representative of Venice; yet his was no isolated example.

The diplomatic corps vied with Cardinals, prelates, and bankers in their patronage of art and literature, as well as in the magnificence and brilliancy of their establishments. In those days men prominent in the field of literature and in the ecclesiastical state were always to be found in the ranks of diplomacy in Rome. Two names shine forth beyond all others: the learned Alberto Pio di Carpi,\* high in the favour of Leo, who first represented the Emperor and

\* Cf. TIRABOSCHI, *Bibl. Mod.*, IV., 156 *seqq.*; FIRMIN DIDOT, *Alde Manuce*, 8 *seqq.*, 30, 46, 145, 333, 409; and NOLHAC, *Erasme en Italie*, 45. Further literature, especially about Carpi's Library, in the *Giorn. d. lett. Ital.*, XXXV., 221. See also ULMANN, II., 453 *seq.*, and GUGLIA, 19 *seq.*, where Carpi's reports are utilized; other reports of his in the *Lett. de' principi*, and in MOLINI, *Docum.*, and also in the National Library, Paris. About the feast given by Carpi in Rome, see SANUTO, XXV., 284.

afterwards Francis I., and Baldassare Castiglione,\* the agent in Rome of the Marquis of Mantua. In the hospitable house of this "Chevalier of the world," as he was called by Charles V., there were gathered all the literati and artists in Rome. Castiglione was the friend not only of Raphael, but also of Michael Angelo, intimacy with whom was so difficult to obtain. The famous "Cortegiano," finished by the Mantuan diplomatist in the first year of the reign of Leo X.,† describes, and indeed idealizes, in wonderfully fluent classical Italian, the manner of life in the most cultivated circles of that day; a society in which the Renaissance had reached its ripest development, and in which signs of decay were already apparent. The perusal of this little book, which unfolds an unique picture of the civilization of the time, gives an excellent idea of the intellectual and brilliant salons of that period.‡ It is true—as Bibbiena deplores§—that there was lacking at Rome an element which formed a striking feature in the Court of Urbino, which he describes, namely, the influence of women. But, in default of this, poets, savants, and artists were the more numerously represented in the Eternal City.

The Renaissance observed no class distinctions, at least they were little insisted on at the Court of Leo X. The highest prelates and diplomatists treated as their equals all who possessed talent and personality. Consequently, humanists, poets, men of learning, and artists came more and more into the foreground, and formed an essential

\* The most important part of the literature relating to Castiglione is to be found collected in GASPARY, II., 684, and FLAMINI, 566.

† Cf., besides Vol V. of this work, 32 *seq.*, GASPARY-ROSSI, II., 2, 287.

‡ Cf. Dr. K. Federer, Ein Salon der Renaissance in No. 11,003 of the N. Fr. Presse of April 2, 1895.

§ Lettere de' principi, I., 136.

element in the higher society of Rome, which was described as the light and stage of the world.

The Eternal City was then what Paris became centuries later—the centre of European culture. To dwell in Rome was the climax of good fortune for every intellectual man of the time. Erasmus speaks for all when he wrote to a Cardinal: “Before I can forget Rome, I must plunge into the river of Lethe.” Each time he recalled his sojourn there, this cold and satirical man was seized with an irresistible longing to return to a place which offered much more to him than the mere monuments of antiquity. “What precious freedom,” he writes, “what treasures in the way of books, what depths of knowledge among the learned, what beneficial social intercourse! Where else could one find such literary society or such versatility of talent in one and the same place?”\*

The extracts from authors devoted to the promotion of literature and art give a complete picture of the intellectual aristocracy of the Rome of the time. To them especially do we owe our knowledge of the importance of the Leonine Court, and, in a measure, of Pope Leo himself as a centre of culture. What a wealth of brilliant names do they make known to us! On one side there are learned men and literati such as Bibbiena, Bembo, Sadoleto, Castiglione, Carpi, Giovio, Lascaris, Inghirami, whose portraits, by the first painters of the time, have been handed down to posterity; and on the other hand the noble company of artists themselves, Raphael, Bramante, Michael Angelo, Baldassare Peruzzi, the two Sansovini, Giuliano and Antonio di Sangallo, Soddoma, Sebastiano del Piombo, Fra Giocondo, Caradosso and many others. It is thanks to these painters that posterity has forgotten much that was

\* REUMONT, III., 2, 144 *seq.* Cf. GREGOROVIVS, VIII., 285, and NOLHAC, *Erasme en Italie*, 65 *seq.*



repulsive in that corrupt and semi-paganized society. They, together with Giovio in his brilliant historic descriptions, have cast an idealized glamour and light over the Leonine Court\* which, even if they only correspond in part to the reality, cast their rays on us to this day.

What wonder that men of the time, carried away by the impression made on them by the capital of the world, spent their whole lives there? However great the evil which may have lurked in the society of those days, still they contained not a little of what was good, which, by the very nature of things, was less spoken of than what was bad. Bearing this in mind, the Leonine age comes before us in a far better moral light than when we allow our judgment to be biassed, at first sight, by manifest and deplorable excesses.† We understand how a man as highly intellectual, earnest, and pious as Sadoletto could look back on his gay youth in Rome with a gentle melancholy.‡

It is a characteristic of the Eternal City that it possesses the power of attracting all that is prominent in the way of intellect, knowledge, and art. But never before or since have her walls contained within them a more brilliant society. It must be admitted that the prevailing tone of society which surrounded the Holy See was worldly, and, in some respects, wholly secular. The priest and the theologian, as such, disappeared when he entered the court

\* "We can never tear ourselves away from the brilliant picture of Leonine Rome as drawn by P. Giovio, however well emphasised the darker side may be," says BURCKHARDT, I.<sup>7</sup>, 201.

† See CIAN, *Giorn. d. lett. Ital.*, XVII., 298 *seqq.*, and XXIX., 405.

‡ See the Letter of Sadoletto to Colocci in 1529, which is discussed by CIAN, *loc. cit.* Cian has with justice rejected the shallow conventionality which describes the time of the Renaissance, and especially the Court of Leo X., as "a great classical bacchanalia and a monstrous orgy of paganism," *Giorn. d. lett. Ital.*, XXIX., 404-405.

circle, teeming with distinguished men, full of the enjoyment of life and of intellectual interests, and absorbed in their enthusiasm for literature, art, music, and the stage.

Leo X. was in every respect fitted to be the centre of this circle. For who exhibited greater splendour than he? Who subsidized so many artists, men of learning, and poets? Who drank in more eagerly all the pleasure that they could offer him? His days were passed in a series of bright and shifting scenes. Great ecclesiastical functions, solemn processions, impressive feasts of the Church, grave Consistories, stately diplomatic receptions, tedious political negotiations, rang the changes with long hunting expeditions, brilliant banquets, musical and dramatic entertainments, recitations of speeches and poetry on the classic model, and the inspection of old and new creations of art. He spent his life in a sort of intellectual intoxication.\* Small wonder that no time remained for the serious task of ecclesiastical reform!

The mode of life and chief occupations of Leo in the vortex of this brilliant existence are attested by so many documents, that it is not difficult to make a sketch of them as they really existed.†

Leo X. was accustomed to rise late. The first person to enter his room was Cardinal Medici's secretary, Gian Matteo Giberti, who received instructions relating to the more important business of state. After him came the datary, with whom the Pope settled matters referring to benefices; after

\* So says RANKE, *Päpste*, I. 7, 58, and MASI, I., 197.

† The chief sources at our command are the reports of the Venetian Ambassadors in SANUTO; *cf.* especially XVI., 543; XXII., 456, 471; XXIV., 103, 105; XXIX., 77, 113, 164; XXX., 374; XXXIV., 199. *Cf.* ALBÈRI, 2nd Series, III., 70; also JOVIUS, *Vita*, lib. 4, and Paris de Grassis in ROSCOE-HENKE, III., 517. Besides these there are many other sources quoted in the following pages.

him, the chamberlains. This business being over, the Pope heard Mass, a habit from which he never departed. After Mass he granted audiences, in the number of which he was very generous. Then followed his dinner, which was usually at an advanced hour. After the meal the Pope usually rested for a short time, and then gave more audiences, or talked with his intimate friends. On these latter occasions cards or chess were played ; Leo detested dice-throwing as immoral. The Pope possessed a very valuable set of chess-men, made of silver gilt.\* These were quite in keeping with the beautiful bell, as painted in his portrait by Raphael, and show how the articles which served Leo for his daily use bore the mark of his artistic taste. In the afternoon the Pope usually took a ride through the Vatican gardens ; though, if he were living out of Rome, he devoted the time to the chase. But his usual residence was in the palace of the Vatican, though during the summer heat he preferred the Belvedere† or the cool Castle of St. Angelo.‡

Leo X. showed the greatest temperance at all parties of pleasure and festivities. He confined himself to one meal in the day, and at this he ate heartily ; but, on the other hand, he fasted three days in the week. On Wednesdays and Fridays he ate only fasting food, and on the latter only fruit, vegetables, and bread. He took a special pleasure in music played during and after the meal ; § and, like a true

\* About this set of chess-men, see Arch. stor. dell' Arte, I., 3, 71 ; cf. CIAN, Cortegiano, 162 ; GNOLI, Secolo di Leone X., 642 ; and CESAREO, 204. On the 5th of October, 1516, Serapica makes this note : a N. S. per giocare duc. 70 ; and again on October 9, 1519, we find a note made of thirteen ducats paid for the Pope's losses at play. Serapica, \*Spese di Leon X., I. State Archives, Rome.

† Arch. stor. Ital., 3rd Series, XXVI., 369.

‡ SANUTO, XXIX., 113. A garden was laid out at St. Angelo ; see

\*Introitus et Exitus, 551, in Secret Archives of the Vatican.

§ SANUTO, XXX., 173.

son of the Renaissance, considered that the entertainment was incomplete without song or the accompaniment of a violin.

From his youth Leo, who had a fine ear and a melodious voice, loved music to the pitch of fanaticism. It was his favourite subject of conversation, and in his private room there stood a musical instrument on which he improvised.\* When a Cardinal, he tried his hand at composition.† The sumptuous banquets which he gave to the members‡ of the Sacred College and other intimates after he was Pope, always terminated with music; and deep into the night the Vatican was filled with joyous strains. When the performance was exceptionally good the Pope was enraptured. With head sunk on his breast and eyes closed he sat, lost to everything, drinking in the sweet tones, which he often accompanied with his voice in an undertone.§

The most distinguished musicians were drawn from all parts of Italy, France, and Spain to the Papal Court. Briefs were sent to various princes and Cardinals for the sole purpose of obtaining the services of some musician or to express thanks for those received.|| If anyone will run

\* FABRONIUS, 206; *cf.* 296. See also ASCHBACH, III., 845 *seq.* As to the musical instruments of that time, see CIAN, *Cortegiano*, 101 *seq.*

† *Cf.* *Kirchenmusikalisches Jahrbuch*, 1888, 394 *seq.*

‡ Among these Luigi d'Aragona especially was a passionate lover of music; see PASTOR, *Reise des Kard. L. d'Aragona*, 24, 30, 44, 56, 78.

§ BEMBI, *Epist.*, XVI., 5; *Vita Anonyma*, 630; JOVIUS, *Vita*, lib. 4. *Cf.* Paris de Grassis, *\*Diarium* in various passages, and *\*Letter of Bald. da Pescia to Lorenzo de' Medici*, June 8, 1514. State Archives, Florence, *Av. il princ.*, CVII.

|| With BEMBI, *Epist.*, IX., 22, 23, X., 37, *cf.* the *\*Briefs to F. Gonzaga* of Aug. 8 and Sept. 25, 1514 (Gonzaga Archives, Mantua); see Appendix, No. 22; see also *ibid.*, *\*Report of Gabbioneta*, June 19, 1514; *\*Brief to Francis I.*, Aug. 3, 1517 (National Archives, Paris), in



his eye through Leo's books of accounts, he will find that, next to goldsmiths, the names of musicians are entered as receiving the highest salaries. Besides the comparatively high pay which they received, there is frequent mention of gratuities from the Pope's private purse.\* The Jew

Appendix, No. 7 ; DESJARDINS, II., 670 ; SANUTO, XXVIII., 488 ; and Manosc. Torrig., XX., 372, XXIV., 10.

\* Cf. Arch. stor. Ital., 3rd Series, III., 1, 216, 222, 224, 226, 228, 231, 233, 234, 235 ; BUONAROTTI, 1871, 246 *seqq.* ; MÜNTZ, Raphaël, 426-427 ; CESAREO, 203. I made a note of the following payments from the \*Introitus et Exitus in the Secret Archives of the Vatican :—

551. 1513, April 18 : flor. 104 cantoribus capell. May 14 : flor. 46 Ioanni Marie Alemano musico secreto S. D. N. ; keep for two months. May 14 : flor. 6 Galeatio Baldo Bonon. musico ; keep for one month. Aug. 8 : payment to Laurentio de Mutina, Nicol. de Albis et Ioanni Iacobo de Zanetio (in other places Tarvisio or Trivino is also mentioned) cantoribus secretis ; f. 192 : Galeatio de Ubaldis musico. Oct. 29 : Antonio Brochier cantori secreto ; f. 226 : Galeatio Badeto musico secreto.

552. 1514, May 15 : Mathie Mariliano et Raphaeli Lunesio musicis S. D. N. June 8 : Raphaeli et Mathie musicis. Juni 10 : Ant. Brochier cantori secreto. June 20 : Gal. Baldo musico.

553. 1514-1515 : the same names as in 551 and 552.

554. (Besides the names already given.) 1515, Aug. 2 : Gabrieli Baldo musico sec. Aug. 27 : Iacopo Larcinto et Nic. de Albis musicis.

555. 1516, March 28 : Ioh. Marie de Medicis musico (obviously the Jew mentioned above). May 30 : Nicol. et Iacopo cantorib. secret. Then follow the same names as above, only written rather differently, except Iocattino Level, Ioh. Brugio.

557. 1517, March 13 : The same names, except payments for Ioh. Ambrosio musico sec., Georgio de Parma musico.

558. 1518-1519. The same names ; besides payment on April 10, 1518, for Laurentio de Bergomotiis and on August 15, 1518 : Camillo filio et Ioh. Marie mus. sec. March 11, 1519 : Franc. et Selimino gallicis cant. sec.

559. 1519-1520. The same names, except June 11, 1519 : Andree de Silva cant. sec. Oct. 11 : Claudio de Alexandris cantori. Nov. 12 : Hieronymo de Ameria mus. sec., and Valentino de la Rue cantori sec.

Giammaria, to whom the nickname of Medici was given, received a monthly pension of twenty-three gold florins.

1520, Jan. 30: Ioh. Bapt. Pontano mus. sec. March 11: Franc. de Manfronibus citeredo S. D. N. (4 ducats monthly).

560. 1520. The same names, excepting on April 30: Cesari Tolentino mus. sec. Aug. 12: Simoni Mallo (or Mella) cant. sec. Sept. 16: Martino mus. sec. and Ioh. Esquino (probably the famous Encina) mus. sec.

No less numerous are the musicians mentioned in \*Serapica's accounts of Leo's private expenditure. In this payments for the following musicians are mentioned: 1516, Aug. 22: Bidone cantore; Io. Maria (see *supra*) musico. Sept. 19: A li tedeschi delli organi duc. 25; A dui cantori de Carpentras. Sept. 29: M. Egidio cantor di capella.—1517, Jan. 5: Musici Milanesi. March 1: Gian Maria musico 45 d. Sept. 8: A un prete musico di far viole duc. 40. Sept. 13: Musici Mantovani; Padre e figlio, musici Milanesi.—1518, May: Musici Mantovani; Un cantor francese. July: Musici Milanesi. July 13: A Jo. Maria giudeo duc. 250. September 4: A quel canta de Orlando duc. 4. September 29: A quello che sonò la lira in la rocha di Viterbo duc. 2. October 9: A uno sonava la citara duc. 1 nel Isola.—1519, January 1: Giachetto cantore da Spelimberto. January 5: Julio Mantuano musico. May 13: A M. Francesco musico duc. 45, and A M. Julio Mantuano musico duc. 45. June 13: A li musici de Re di Francia, duc. 115; A li musici tedeschi, duc. 20. August 13: Hieron. da Asti musico.—1520, April 8: Piffari Milanesi. July 21: A uno musico di Corneto, duc. 90 per sua provisione di 3 mesi. In August, September, and October expenses for Marc Antonio musico and for Jo. Maria musico di Corneto. August 21: Expenses quando andò la musica alla Magliana. August 22: A Gaspare Fiamingo cantore, duc. 54. October 18: Al sonator de la citara che canta de improvviso.—1521, January 1: A Galeazo musico, duc. 30 per batezar el suo pucto. February 18: Marc Antonio musico. March 19: Duc. 172 dati per mancia ali cantori, pifari et trombetti et altri musici. April 1: A Nostro Signore duc. 60 dette per mancia a piu musici in Belvedere. June: A tre sonatori de arpa, tamborino et violetto che sonavono el di de S. Joanni inanti a N. S. duc. 3. September 29: Ali cantori, trombetti et altri musici furono al pasto di S. Cosma duc. 284, jul. 7½. SERAPICA, \*Spese private di Leon X., lib. I., II., III. State Archives, Rome.

and the appointment of castellan of the town of Verucchio.\* Musical talent among the clergy was often made the occasion of ecclesiastical promotion.†

With his love of music it was natural that Leo should attach great importance to its use in the services of the Church. The numerous musicians above mentioned were not subsidized by him solely for his own gratification, or for the purpose of social entertainment, but largely for the increase of devotion in the great ecclesiastical functions, on the worthy celebration of which the heart of the Pope was so set. However devoid he might be of formalism in the ordinary intellectual affairs of life, he always exacted great punctiliousness in the details of divine worship. On such occasions he gave the most edifying example by his solemn demeanour and pious behaviour.‡

The Papal Choir, for which French, Dutch, and Spanish as well as Italian singers were engaged, was raised to such perfection that contemporaries could not contain their enthusiasm.§ There was, therefore, good reason why the

\* Regest. Leonis X., n. 3315. Cf. Arch. stor. Ital., 3rd Series, III., 1, 226; ROSSI, Pasquinate, 99 *seq.*; VOGELSTEIN, II., 35, 119; and KATT, *Musici ebrei Rinascimento*, in the *Corriere Israelitico*, Trieste, 1903. In the \*Rotulus of 1514, Io. Maria musicus appears among the Scutifferi.

† FABRONIUS, 205, 207.

‡ Numerous examples of this are given by Paris de Grassis, \**Diarium*, XII., 23, Secret Archives of the Vatican.

§ See Paris de Grassis, ed. DELICATI-ARMELLINI, 66; BURCKHARDT, II., 7th ed., 321. Cf. SCHULTE, 202 *seq.*, at 258 *seq.* there is a list of the singers under Leo X., which is, however, by no means complete. About the famous Costanzo Festa, see AMBROS, III., 2nd ed., 583; *ibid.*, 276 *seq.* about Eleazar Genet. He was magister capellae in 1514; see the Brief to the Cardinal of S. Sabina, Sept. 1, 1514, in which Eleazar Genet is recommended for a benefice. In this it is said "quanto cantores nostros amore prosequimur preestim Eleazarium qui ejusdem capelle nostre magister existit." Draft of Sadoletto in Arm., XLIV., t. 5, f. 60; cf. Regest. Leonis X., n. 11,348, and 17,640.



choir should occupy such an important place in the painting of the Coronation of Charlemagne in the Stanze. Further, it is only when we learn how constantly Leo X. was sending to Florence for books of sacred music, especially masses, that we can understand why Raphael painted his patron holding such a book.\* This was quite as illustrative of the mind of Leo X. as the introduction of musical instruments in the arabesques of the Loggie.

Leo often procured costly instruments ornamented with gold and silver, and ordered them himself from German makers.† He procured from Naples an organ adorned with alabaster, which Baldassare Castiglione declared was

(Secret Archives of the Vatican). For Nicol. de Pictis, 1513, cantor prior, see Regest. Leonis X., n. 3560. The celebrated Spaniard, Juan de la Encina, was for a long time the director of the Papal Choir; *cf.* TICKNOR, I., 223 *seq.*, and II., 695 *seq.*; *Zeitschr. f. rom. Phil.*, XVII. (1893), 586; *Giorn. d. lett. Ital.*, V., 395, VII., 273, IX., 325. For the Florentine Pietro Aaron, *cf.* ROSCOE-BOSSI, XII., 93. GRAVISI, in *Atti d. Soc. Istriana*, II., Parenzo, 1885, deals with Leo X. and the musician Andrea Antico. See also HABERL, *Musikkatalog des päpstlichen Kapellenarchivs*, Leipzig, 1888, 5, 10, 42 *seq.*, 49, 51, 66. Paris de Grassis mentions an improvement in the singing of the Papal Choir in Holy Week, 1514; see Regest. Leonis X., p. 503. *Cf.* LUZIO, Isabella d'Este, 29 *seq.*; *cf.* TOUGARD, *Les chantres Normands de la chapelle du pape (1418-1514)* in the *Bull. de la Soc. de l'hist. de Normandie*, IX.

\* On the 6th of October, 1513, Giuliano de' Medici writes thus to Lorenzo: \*N. S<sup>re</sup> vorrebbe certi miei libri di musica che restorono costi et maxime uno di messe. Quando la M. V. li manderà verranno a S. S<sup>ta</sup> et a me molto grati. Av. il princ., CVIII. *Cf.*, in *Carte Stroz.*, III. (*Minutario di lettere del M. Lorenzo*), the \*Letter to Giuliano, Oct. 14, 1513. State Archives, Florence.

† On the 30th of September, 1517, there were paid duc. 1000 Corrado Trompa (in the margin, Trompet is written) de Noliebergo (sic!) pro uno horologio et certis instrumentis musicis per eum datis S. D. N. et auro et argento laboratis. \*Introit. et Exit., 557. Secret Archives of the Vatican.



the most beautiful thing he had ever seen or heard.\* Cardinal Luigi d'Aragona presented the Pope with a valuable little organ.†

Next to music, improvisation was the entertainment most appreciated by the Renaissance. The art of giving expression in verse to the things of the moment is inherent in the gifted Italian people. Leo X. would not have been the son of Lorenzo the Magnificent had he not taken special delight in this kind of amusement. He himself often took part in the elegant poetic contests, which were a greater ornament to his table than the costly plate, choice dishes, and rare wines.

In the art of improvisation, after Tebaldeo, Accolti, and Strascino,‡ Raffaello Brandolini and Andrea Marone displayed most talent.§ They were both men of real poetical gifts. The first, a fellow-countryman of Leo's, had enjoyed special marks of favour from the latter even before his election. Apartments in the Vatican were now given

\* \*Non tacerò ancor questa nova che da Napoli è stato portato al papa un organo di alabastro, el più bello et il migliore che mai sia stato visto ne udito. B. Castiglione to the Marquis of Mantua from Rome, July 16, 1521. Gonzaga Archives, Mantua.

† Este Report in ADEMOLLO, Alessandro VI., Giulio II. e Leone X. nel Carnevale, 90.

‡ About Tebaldeo and Accolti, see *infra*, pp. 195, 215, 217 *seq.* About the Sienese Niccolò Campani, called Strascino, who often improvised before Leo X., see ADEMOLLO, Alessandro VI., etc., 79, and CESAREO 207; and also more literary details in GASPARY-ROSSI, II., 2, 305, and FLAMINI, 558. Cf. Giorn. d. lett. Ital., XXXIX., 204 *seq.* SERAPICA, on Aug. 27, 1518, makes the following entry in the \*Spese private di Leone X.: duc. 50 date a Strascino. State Archives, Rome. Cf. CIAN, Giorn. stor. d. lett. Ital., XLVIII., 422.

§ For more about Brandolini, see *infra*, pp. 222 and 222 n. For Marone, see ROSCOE-BOSSI, VII., 201 *seq.*; BUDIK, I., XLIX. *seq.*; Giorn. d. lett. Ital., XI., 156 *seq.*; ROSSI, Pasquinate, 117 *seq.*; and GEREMIA, Andrea Marone, Palermo, 1901.

to him; and so indispensable was he to Leo, that he went by the name of the apple of the Pope's eye—a curious nickname for one who was blind. Marone of Brescia possessed even greater readiness in clothing the most ordinary events on the spur of the moment in elegant Latin verse. Raphael has immortalized him in his picture of the violin-player.\* He knew how to enhance the effect of his improvisations by an accompaniment on the lute or violin, and by the lively play of his features. The verses which flowed from his lips displayed such power and richness of thought that his hearers were quite carried away.† He won especial renown by his verses delivered at a banquet given by the Pope to the Ambassadors in 1517; his theme was the Turkish question, which at that time absorbed all interest. Giovio has preserved for posterity the beginning of this improvisation, and the Pope rewarded the poet by the gift of a benefice in the archdiocese of Capua.

On festivals Leo X. sometimes started a contest among his improvisatori, the theme of which was set by himself. Once—on the feast of the patron saints of the Medici, SS. Cosmas and Damian—Brandolini and Marone were thus measured against each other. The Pope, who acted as a severe critic of subject, language and metre, this time adjudged the prize to Marone.‡

The discussion of serious, learned, and even religious subjects alternated at the Pope's table with these lighter recreations; for Leo X. lost no opportunity of extending his knowledge and cultivating his mind.§ He was, how-

\* PASSAVANTI, I., 299, II., 335.

† JOVIUS, *Elogia*, I., xxii.; cf. AMBROS, III., 490.

‡ See FOGLIAZZI, R. Brandolini Dialogus, Venetiis, 1753, 48.

§ Mathaeus Herculanus in FABRONIUS, 296. Slight as are the traces we can find of this, such a mixture of subjects was not unusual.

ever, so essentially a child of his age that, in spite of his interest in higher subjects, he took the greatest pleasure in the low jokes of professional buffoons.\* The mummary in which they indulged might seem incredible, were it not for the testimony of the most reliable contemporary writers. At the very table with Cardinals, Ambassadors, poets and artists, jesters, half-crazy poetasters, and parasites carried on unchidden their repulsive and foolish calling. Leo X., who was himself exceedingly temperate both in eating and drinking, treated his guests with lavish profusion. His successor was amazed by the enormous kitchen bills, in which peacocks' tongues occupied a large place. The greediness of the buffoons, about which the strangest anecdotes were circulated, was turned into a joke by Leo himself, who gave orders that dishes of apes and ravens should be placed before them.†

The names have come down to us of a number of such jesters, by whose coarse jokes and wit Leo X. allowed himself to pass the time; he had a notion that diversions of this kind would serve to prolong his life.‡ The most famous of all the buffoons was Fra Mariano;§ this man,

*Cf.* the remarks of LUZIO-RENIER in the *Giorn. d. lett. Ital.*, XXXV., 243, about the "miscuglio di giocondità e di serietà" noticeable in Isabella d'Este.

\* Besides BURCKHARDT, I., 7th ed., 170 *seq.*, *cf.* the precious little treatise of LUZIO, *Buffoni, nani e schiavi dei Gonzaga*, Roma, 1891; GABOTTO, 15 *seqq.*, 23 *seqq.*, 45 *seqq.*; *Giorn. d. lett. Ital.*, XXIV., 446 (about Rodocanachi's book), and the special literature quoted in note *infra*. That buffoons were considered indispensable at feasts is explained by SANUTO, XXVI., 19.

† JOVIUS, *Vita*, lib. 4. *Cf.* GRAF, *Cinquecento*, 370 *seq.*

‡ *Vita Anonyma*, *loc. cit.*

§ There is an extensive literature about Leo's buffoons, especially Fra Mariano. Besides that mentioned in the note *supra*, see FABRONIUS, 295; GAYE, II., 135 *seqq.*; GRAF, *Cinquecento*, 370 *seqq.*;

whose real name was Fetti, had been barber to the Pope's father, Lorenzo the Magnificent. Later he attached himself to Savonarola and entered the Dominican Order, without, however, giving up his buffooneries; it was not only his low wit, but also his total want of manners and incredible appetite, that caused merriment to his master and the Court, even though the story of his having devoured forty eggs and twenty roast chickens at one meal is certainly an exaggeration. It cannot be established with certainty what position he held in his Order, but it is most likely that he was only a lay-brother.\*

But Fra Mariano must have been in some ways better than his reputation; otherwise he could not have been the friend of the earnest Fra Bartolommeo. He showed his love of art by the decorations of the chapel in S. Silvestro on the Quirinal, which he employed Baldassare Peruzzi and Polidoro da Caravaggio to paint.† Fra Mariano must have been a man of some capacity, for, when Bramante died in April, 1514, Leo X. made him "piombatore" (or one of those whose business it was to seal the Papal Bulls with

Giorn. d. lett. Ital., XVI., 254, 466, XVII., 284, XVIII., 460, XXVIII., 52, XLII., 287, 292; CIAN in the Arch. stor. Lomb., XVIII., 406 *seqq.*, and La Cultura, 1891, No. 20; LUZIO in the Arch. d. Soc. Rom., IX., 572 *seqq.*; CALMO, Lettere, 64 *seqq.*; TAORMINA, Un frate alla corte di Leone X., Palermo, 1890; ROSSI, Pasquinate, 85 *seqq.* (Fra Mariano), 91 *seq.* (Brandino detto il Cordiale), 101 *seqq.* (Moro de' Nobili), 105 *seqq.* (Mastro Andrea dipintore) 144 *seqq.* (Poggio); Masi, I., 170 *seqq.*, 212. Cf. LUZIO, Isabella d'Este, 31.

\* MARCHESE (Mem. d. pittori ecc. Domenic., II., 4th ed., Bologna, 1874, 104 *seq.*) takes this view as a certainty.

† This chapel (the first on the left as you enter), which is well preserved, has been saved from oblivion by GNOLI'S excellent essay in the Arch. stor. dell' Arte, IV., 117 *seqq.* The pavement of majolica tiles, such as used to be in the Loggie, is reproduced in chromolithograph in TESORINI, tav. 1, figs. 1 and 2.



lead), with an annual income of 800 ducats. This appointment was found fault with even by a courtier so devoted to the Medici as Baldassare Turini.\* On a par with this was the Pope's consent to his transfer to the Cistercian Order, without his being deprived of the right of living as before in the monastery of S. Silvestro.†

In a certain sense this half-crazy poetaster belonged to that class of buffoons whose vanity was often made ridiculous in a cruel way.‡ One of these, Camillo Querno by name, had come to Rome from his native town of Monopoli in Apulia, hoping to make his fortune; the Roman literati soon took the measure of their man. Querno, a corpulent creature with long flowing hair, was invited by them to a symposium at which he was made to drink and sing alternately. After he had proved his qualifications in both these respects, he was crowned with a wreath of vine-leaves, cabbage, and laurel, and solemnly dubbed with the name of arch-poet. The poor man took all this quite seriously, and shed tears of joy; his self-conceit rose when

\* See the testimony which GNOLI has made public in *Nuova Antologia*, 3rd Series, XIV., 585. Also Giovan Francesco Poggio received, among other marks of favour, a lucrative post of "sollicitatore" of Papal Briefs; see ROSSI, *Pasquinate*, 144. By being holders of these secondary posts, the buffoons of the Italian Renaissance were essentially in a different position from that of the court fools to the north of the Alps; see LUZIO, *loc. cit.*, 10-11.

† Regest. Leonis X., n. 8545. The transfer of Mariano to the Cistercian Order, which has hitherto remained a mystery, is explained by the fact that the office of "Bullator," which was conferred on him, had to be held by a Cistercian; see TANGL, 216.

‡ To these, besides those mentioned in the text, belonged Giovanni Gazoldo, Girolamo Brittonio, and the stammering Cinotto; cf. ROSSI, *Pasquinate*, 16 *seqq.*, 80 *seqq.*; LUZIO, 11; GNOLI, *Secolo*, II., 646 *seq.* For presents in money to Gazoldo and others in Serapica, \*Spese priv. di Leone X.—1518, June 26: al Gazoldo duc. 12; Nov. 20: al Gazoldo duc. 1. State Archives, Rome.

he was invited to the Pope's table, where he became the occasion of constant mirth, not only by his improvised verse—which he declaimed on one occasion clad as Venus—but by his prodigious hunger and thirst. If he made a mistake in his verses, he was punished by water being mixed with his wine. Sometimes, the story goes, Leo replied to his “arch-poet” in verses improvised by himself; he gave him a monthly pension of nine ducats.\* If these stories are true, it is clear that the Pope possessed great facility in improvising verses.†

Still more cruel was the ridicule cast on the improvisatore Baraballo of Gaeta, whose vanity knew no bounds. This rhymester considered himself another Petrarch. The more mad his poems the greater was the praise showered on him at the Pope's table; he swallowed all this, and was at last so puffed up that he claimed the right to be crowned poet on the Capitol. It was decided by his tormentors that his wish would be granted, and it was arranged that he should ride to the Capitol, in the garb of a Roman conqueror, and mounted on the back of the elephant which the King of Portugal had presented to Leo X. Those who organized the farce were not ashamed to fix it for the feast of the patron saints of the Medici. Even the fact that Baraballo was a cleric, and belonged to a distinguished family, was not allowed to stand in the way of the jest. So full of conceit was Baraballo that,

\* Cf. \*Serapica, Spese priv. di Leon X., II.—1519, December 25: Al archipoeta per sua provisione di Dec., Gennaio e Febraio d. 27. 1520, March 27: A. M. Camillo Querno archipoeta d. 27 per sua provisione for three months; April 2: Al archipoeta duc. 27. 1521, February 21: Al archipoeta duc. 27. State Archives, Rome.

† Cf. JOVIUS, *Elogia clar. vir. imag. apposita*, Venet., 1546, 51; ROSCOE-BOSSI, VII., 204 *seqq.*; Arch. d. Soc. Rom., IX., 576; GNOLI, *Secolo di Leon X.*, 642 *seq.*; and the detailed account by E. GIRARDI in the *Rassegna Pugliese*, II., n. 2-4, Trani, 1885.

disregarding the remonstrances of his relatives, he went to the Vatican at the appointed time, clad in festal robes of green velvet and crimson silk trimmed with ermine, made after an ancient pattern. He was solemnly received at the palace and conducted to the Pope. "Had I not seen it with my own eyes," writes Giovio, "I would not have believed that a man, sixty years of age, and with grey hair, could have lent himself to such a comedy." The verses recited by Baraballo were so foolish that those who heard him could with difficulty smother their laughter; then the poet was led to the Piazza of St. Peter's. The Pope looked out of the window, and through his glass could see the poet mounted on the magnificently ornamented beast, and led away to the sound of drums and trumpets. However, on the bridge of St. Angelo, the elephant shied and threw the hero on to the pavement, and the jest was nearly turned into a tragedy.\* The spirit of the age was such that we must not be surprised that poets were found to celebrate the incident in verse. But that this act of buffoonery should have been immortalized in an intarsia on one of the doors of the Stanze, shows a want of taste difficult to surpass.

Baraballo might have congratulated himself on coming out of the affair with a whole skin; for it fared worse with other poets of his stamp. During the Carnival of 1519, a comedy was acted which proved to be a complete fiasco; as a penalty for his failure, Leo X. had its author—a monk—punished before his eyes in a truly cruel manner. He was tossed in a blanket, and then scourged till the

\* Cf. JOVIUS, Vita, l. 4; SANUTO, XIX., 74; Manosc. Torrig., XX., 41; ROSCOE-BOSSI, VII., 208 *seqq.*; GABOTTO, 55. According to Giovio, Leo made merry in like fashion over his secretary Evangelista Tarasconio, who considered himself a great musical theorist; cf. ROSSI, Pasquinate, 116.

blood flowed.\* As a compensation he received two ducats.† The poetaster Gazoldo also often received the bastinado as a reward for his bad verses.‡ The roughness and unseemliness of manners at the Papal Court is further shown by the story of a gentleman who was so provoked by Querno's gluttony that he wounded him in the face.

In explanation of Leo's love for jokes of all sorts, it has been pointed out that this was a characteristic of all Florentines, and especially of the Medici.§ Nevertheless, there is something in the highest degree incongruous in a prince as capable as he was of the most refined intellectual enjoyment, taking pleasure in coarse and foolish buffoonery.|| The matter has, however, a very serious side. Though in nearly every other place, princes—and in Germany many secularized bishops—might indulge in these kinds of amusements, in a Pope pleasure of this kind was utterly unworthy. This is admitted by Giovio in spite of his enthusiasm for the hero of his book.¶ Such things must be judged even more severely from the standpoint of the present day; with a total disregard for the menacing signs of the time, he threw himself more and

\* Cf. the report of Paolucci, who, it is true, writes from hearsay only, in the *Nuova Antologia*, 3rd Series, XIV., 583. BURCKHARDT, I., 7th ed., 170, referring to such proceedings, reminds his readers of the jests practised on her savants by Christina of Sweden.

† March 10, 1519: A. M. Ant. di Spello duc. 2, disse per dare al frate de la comedia. \*Serapica, *Spese priv.*, II. State Archives, Rome.

‡ ROSCOE-BOSSI, VII., 207.

§ LUZIO, 10.

|| "Certamente Leone ebbe una natura da stremo a stremo, nè saria opra da ognuno il giudicare chi più gli dilettaſſe, o le virtu de' dotti o le ciance de' buffoni; e de ciò fa fede il suo aver dato a l'una ed l'altra specie, esaltando tanto questi quanto quegli," writes ARETINO, *Lettere*, I., Parigi, 1606, 26b.

¶ JOVIUS, *Vita*, l. 4.



more into such coarse and foolish pleasures up to the very brink of the great catastrophe.

More comprehensible was Leo's great devotion to the noble art of venery. In spite of the prohibitions of the Church, many Cardinals had, ever since the days of Scarampo, devoted themselves to the chase,\* to the pleasures of which a Pope now gave himself over.

In July, 1513, Leo X. wrote thus to Cardinal Farnese, who had invited him to a hunt: "Would that I were free like you, and could accept your invitation."† Whether pressure of business or scruples restrained the Pope on this occasion, it is impossible to say. In January, 1514, he yielded to a similar invitation from Farnese, and devoted nearly the whole of October to the delights of hunting. Thenceforward this became a yearly custom.‡ As soon as the first rains had tempered the heat of the Roman summer, the Pope began his progress through the immediate and more remote neighbourhood of Rome. The time was well chosen, for most of the business was dormant, as, according to ancient custom, October was regarded as a holiday month by the officials of the Curia. The Campagna, fresh with its new vegetation, offered irresistible enticements to country excursions; as for sport, no better time of the year could be chosen. Leo, as a rule, went along the Via Cassia, over Monterosi and Nepi, to the woody hill-country round Viterbo, where he took the warm baths. The neighbourhood was favourable for hawking, a sport to which Leo was devoted with all the passion of a true Italian; for hours together he would watch the carefully-

\* GNOLI, *Cacce*, 3 *seqq.* As to the chase in general at that time, see CIAN, *Cortegiano*, 49.

† See the text of the \*Letter (Secret Archives of the Vatican) in Appendix, No. I.

‡ Cf. the survey of Leo's country excursions in GNOLI, *Cacce*, 35-36.

trained hawks bringing down quails, partridges, and pheasants. From Viterbo he proceeded to the Lake of Bolsena, famous for its eel-fishery ; there Cardinal Farnese entertained his sovereign in regal fashion at his beautiful estate of Capo di Monte. Leo delighted to dwell on the picturesque island of Martana, which was equally fitted for fishing and hawking. "Year after year," sings the Farnese poet, "is Leo pleased to visit my domain, and bathe his sacred countenance in my waters." From Bolsena the Pope moved on by short stages over Toscanella to Corneto, whence, hunting all the while, he passed over the stretch of country covered with Etruscan monuments to Civitavecchia and the forests of Cervetri. The locality abounded in deer and wild boars, for the pursuit of which the plain, surrounded by pleasant hills, was so suited that it could be compared to a trap for game. A mile from Civitavecchia, at Santa Marinella, the deer used to take to the sea, where they were caught by huntsmen in boats. By Palo, still the eldorado of quail-hunters, the Pope returned to Rome via Magliana.\*

His was indeed a truly royal hunting-ground, bounded on the south by the Tiber, on the east by the ancient Via Cassia, and on the west by the glistening sea, while on the north it extended to the steep precipices of Corneto. Here too lay the territory of his relatives the Orsini, whose hospitable castle was thrown open to him. Roughly speaking, these hunting excursions took up a month of every autumn.† Sometimes, under pressure of business,

\* JOVIUS, Vita, l. 4 ; SANUTO, XXIX., 442-443 ; GNOLI, Cacce, 41 *seq.*, 43 *seq.*

† Accounts differ as to the duration and frequency of the Pope's hunting expeditions. JOVIUS (*loc. cit.*) declares that Leo X. minded neither wind nor weather nor rough travelling, provided only that he could satisfy his desire for sport. Paris de Grassis speaks of an

either political or ecclesiastical, the Pope had to shorten or interrupt his holiday; but he would never forego it altogether. Neither wind, rain, nor cold, nor the gravity of the political situation, could keep him from this recreation.\* His chief companions were the younger Cardinals, of whom, as regards the chase, Luigi d'Aragona, and after him Orsini, were the leaders.†

In the age of the Renaissance Cardinals could often be seen in the hunting-ground, and Ascanio Sforza, as well as Sanseverino, were ardent disciples of Nimrod. But hitherto Popes had been present on only a few occasions. Leo X. was the first who regularly devoted his time to the sport, reserved for himself a hunting preserve, and organized Papal hunting expeditions on a large scale. To do this he spared no expense. A special huntsman-in-chief was appointed in the person of Domenico Boccamazzo; nets, hounds, and a great part of the hunting equipment were sent for from France.‡ Cardinals, Princes, and Ambassadors vied with one another in making rich presents to

absence from Rome of at most two or three months; but he has not taken into consideration the interruptions at Palo and Magliana. Cf. GNOLI, 35-36.

\* Cf. SANUTO, XVII., 486; XXIII., 74, 437; XXIV., 51; XXVI., 38, 142, 176, 216, 219, 223. \*Letters of Bald da Pescia to Lorenzo de' Medici, dat. June 16, 20, 22, 1514 (State Archives, Florence), Av. il princ., CVII. Sometimes he received an Ambassador even while he was on a hunting expedition; see SANUTO, XXVI., 420. How the Pope made use of these occasions as a pretext not to speak with the Imperial Ambassador Manuel, is told in the report of the latter, Nov. 20, 1520, in BERGENROTH, II., n. 310.

† GNOLI, *Cacce*, 15.

‡ GNOLI, *Cacce*, 8 *seqq.*, 13 *seqq.*, 15 *seqq.*, 18. The \*Brief of May 2, 1518, in which Prospero Colonna is appointed protector of game and "commissarius super venatione Campanie et Marittime," was hitherto unknown. Secret Archives of the Vatican, Arm., XXXIX., t. 31, n. 16.

the Pope of valuable hounds, pheasants, and trained hawks,\* an eloquent proof of the passion of Leo X. for the chase.

Even then this occupation of the Pope caused scandal. In reply to those who found fault with it, considerations of health were adduced, which did, as a matter of fact, count for a great deal in the pursuits favoured by Leo. Physicians, having regard to his extreme stoutness and heated blood, urged him strongly to take bodily exercise, to ride, and to be as much as possible in the open air. But none of these considerations for his health can justify the excessive devotion to the chase, which is emphasized even by Giovio.†

In the panegyrics of the court poets,‡ the Pope, when

\* As well as to GNOLI, 14 *seq.*, I refer for this to SANUTO, XXVIII., 136, and to the following \*Briefs: (1) To Alfonso I. of Ferrara, dated Rome, Dec. 1, 1513 (in which "Ioannes Antonius pardorum magister," returning to Ferrara, is recommended to him). State Archives, Modena. (2) To the Marquis Francesco Gonzaga of Mantua, dated Rome, June 1, 1518 (in which he is thanked for "aves praestantes falcones vocatos," which have been sent by him). (3) To the same, dated in villa nostra Manliana, April 28, 1520 (in which thanks are returned for "falcones, qui quidem eo tempore venerunt quo propediem eorum experimentum eramus capturi"). Nos. 2 and 3 in the Gonzaga Archives, Mantua. The animals were kept partly at Magliana, partly in the old Viridarium at the Vatican. In the \*Introitus et Exitus, 551 (Secret Archives of the Vatican), we find in the autumn of 1513 repeated entries of payments to Franc. de Ferrara custodi leopardi D. N.

† JOVIUS, Vita, l. 4. Cf. Mathaeus Herculanus in FABRONIUS, 296. Similar reasons are given by Leo himself; see BEMBI, Epist., X., 1, and Regest. Leonis X., n. 12,147. Cf. also the letter of Longueil in ROSCOE-HENKE, III., 616 *seqq.*

‡ Cf. Tranquilli Molossi Palietum seu descriptio venationis quam Alex. Farnesius in Palieti sui silvis Leoni X., P. M. aliisque Romanae aulae proceribus paravit, published by G. ANDRES, Anecdota graeca



following the chase, is described as playing the part of a king of the gods, who, like a calm and disinterested onlooker, sits enthroned above the turmoil. In contrast with the excited Cardinals, he is represented as benignly observing the mad scurry from an elevated position, dispensing praise and blame, and at sunset solemnly commanding the slaughter to cease, and dividing the booty with noble generosity among the huntsmen on their return. Giovio gives a more realistic picture of the Pope as a sportsman, and tells how he understood the art of waiting with unfailing patience, according to the recognized laws of venery, and also how he would show unwonted severity towards anyone who frightened the game by loud speech. He was almost inconceivably sharp and violent in his expressions of displeasure, even with those of high estate, if the result of the hunt were unfavourable, owing to the neglect or inexperience of any in the party. Woe to him who, after a misadventure of this kind, had the folly to approach the incensed Pontiff with a petition! Those who knew him best seized their opportunity to make a request when Leo was returning from a successful hunt. Then he would grant extraordinary favours with lavish profusion, especially to those who had distinguished themselves in the day's sport.\*

Giovio does not inform us of the part taken personally by the Pope in the sport. According to the account given by the secretary of Cardinal d'Aragona, the Pope, spectacles

et latina I, Napoli, 1816; Epitome in ROSCOE-BOSSI, XII., 130 *seqq.*; *cf.* GNOLI, 30 *seq.* The poems of Guido Postumo Silvestri have been reprinted by ROSCOE-BOSSI, *loc. cit.*, 184 *seqq.*, 208 *seqq.* A poet of Perugia describes a hunt in which Leo X. and Giampaolo Baglioni took part at Viterbo; see BELLUCCI, I., *Manosc. d. com. di Perugia*, 127 *seqq.*, and l'Umbria, 1898, I., n. 5-6.

\* JOVIUS, Vita, l. 4.

on nose, would at times despatch with a lance a deer taken in the nets.\*

In the Ovidian verses in which Guido Postumo described Leo's hunt at Palo, he clothes the Pope in a white garment ; but the picture drawn by Paris de Grassis of how his master set forth to hunt is certainly nearer the truth. "He left Rome without a stole," writes the shocked Master of Ceremonies in January, 1514 ; "and, what is worse, without his rochet ; and, worst of all, with boots on. That is quite improper, for no one can kiss his feet." When this was pointed out to the Pope, he laughed, as though it did not concern him in the least.† The Cardinals who accompanied Leo X. showed still less regard for what was suitable in the way of attire. A Venetian Ambassador saw Cardinal Cornaro hunting in a short scarlet doublet and a Spanish hat.‡

In a report of the 29th of April, 1518,§ the Venetian Ambassador gives a short sketch of the day's programme on one of these hunting expeditions, at which the Pope was present, sometimes on horseback, sometimes in a sedan-chair. The first thing in the morning, the masters of the hunt came to inform him of the places where spoil was to be found. Roe-deer and boars were the first to be sought, and then hawking began. Immediately after a luncheon the Pope started forth again, conversing until he reached

\* \*Letter of Ant. de Beatis, May 1, 1518, in Appendix, No. 9 (Gonzaga Archives, Mantua). GNOLI, 15, and BURCKHARDT, I., 7th ed., 378, must be corrected by this well-authenticated account ; cf. LUZIO, Isabella d'Este, 64-82.

† ROSCOE-HENKE, III., 520.

‡ Description by an eye-witness in ALBÈRI, 3rd Series, III., 94.

§ SANUTO, XXV., 385 *seqq.* Cf. the Letter of Nov. 26, 1520 ; *ibid.*, XXIX., 442 *seqq.* Both these important accounts have escaped Gnoli's notice, who has in other respects completely collected all that relates to this.

the point at which he could let loose the dogs after some beast.

The grand style in which the hunt was conducted is shown by authoritative accounts. In January, 1514, a Mantuan Ambassador gives an account of a hunt organized by Alessandro Farnese, in which the Pope and eighteen Cardinals took part.\* The number of dogs sent out to track the game was between sixty and seventy. The suite of the Pope—Cardinals, prelates, servants, literati, buffoons, actors, and musicians—amounted, roughly speaking, to one hundred and forty. To this was added the bodyguard of about one hundred and sixty men. If we take into account the difficulties of their maintenance in a poor district, this number was very considerable.† Sometimes hunting excursions are mentioned in which from a thousand to two thousand horsemen took part.‡

In all his excursions the kindly master of the hunt was greeted with joy by the poor, who made every preparation in their power to do him honour. His biographer§ describes in vivid colours how boys and girls and old people arranged themselves on the road where Leo X. was to pass by, to greet him and offer him presents. He rewarded these in such princely fashion that the peasants, according to the expression of the same author, saw in his arrival among them a harvest far more productive than the most fruitful in their fields. He gave money without counting it; he even called bystanders up to him and asked them if there was anything amiss with them in

\* BASCHET, Catherine de Médicis, 243.

† Cf. GNOLI, 14, 26, 36, 39, 43 *seq.*

‡ SANUTO, XVII., 486; XXIX., 443. The presence of the strong bodyguard is explained by the fear in which the Pope stood for his life at those times; see BERGENROTH, II., n. 303.

§ JOVIUS, Vita, l. 4.

their homes. As he went by he gladly dowered poor girls, and paid the debts of the sick and aged, and of those burdened with large families. The account-books of his confidential chamberlain Serapica testify to this. Sometimes it is a church or convent, sometimes a woman with child, sometimes an unfortunate person whose house has been burnt down, sometimes a boy who wishes to study, sometimes a girl who wants to marry, or sometimes the poor of St. Lazarus—whose motley ranks, clamouring “For the love of God,” experience the well-known liberality of the large-hearted Pontiff. Not one returned home empty-handed who had in any way helped in the hunt. Each disbursement varies from ten to fifty ducats.\*

Leo showed the same benevolent spirit when he was living at his country-house at Magliana, whither he went not only during his autumn hunting excursion, but often in the course of the year when the turmoil and business of Rome became too great. There, in the solitude of the silent Campagna, he lived at his ease, and delighted in mixing in his kindly way with the shepherds and peasants of the neighbourhood.

Magliana was well suited for a holiday resort, because the more important affairs of government could be carried on from there, being only a few miles to the west of the Porta Portese in Rome, close to the Tiber, and on the left-hand side of the road to Fiumicino. Numbers of trees had been cut down, and owing to this the air was becoming more and more malarious. The castle† and its neighbour-

\* See the items from the account-books in GNOLI, *Cacce*, 37 *seqq.*

† Concerning Magliana and its former fresco decoration, *cf.* NIBBY, *Dintorni*, II., 284 *seqq.*; HASE in the *Blättern für literar. Unterhaltung*, 1841, Nos. 334, 335; GRUNER, *I Freschi della Villa Magliana*, London, 1847; REUMONT, *Kunstblatt*, 1848, No. 48; RICHTER, *Der Zeitschr. f.*



hood offered but few attractions saving those connected with sport; this alone explains why Girolamo Riario, the nephew of Sixtus IV., built it as a pleasure place; it was also enlarged under Innocent VIII. and Julius II., and embellished by the favourite of the latter, Cardinal Alidosi. The place, once so beautifully decorated, in which Leo X. loved to dwell with his intimate friends, his huntsmen, musicians, poets, and buffoons, is now a dilapidated farm, the halls of which are used as barns. Thousands pass it by every year in the railway to Civita-vecchia, without giving a thought to the brilliant feasts which used to be held there, or the important decisions arrived at within its walls. Battlements crown the surrounding walls and a moat encloses it. At first sight it seems to be only one of the many deserted castles scattered over the Campagna; but as we enter through the great door into the courtyard, we see at once by the buildings on either side that it must have been the abode of some great noble. A hall, with three arches and octagonal pilasters, and a groined roof, stands in the left wing, above the windows of which the name of Innocent VIII. can be read. A hall contiguous to the right corner of this, with five arches, was erected, as we are told by an inscription, by Julius II. The arms of the Rovere Pope and those of Alidosi can be seen in the banqueting-hall on the ground-floor. A broad and magnificent staircase, a portion of the

bild. Kunst., X., 126 *seqq.*; SCHULZ, *Der Zeitschr. für Bauwesen.*, 1895; GRUYER in the *Gaz. des Beaux-Arts*, 1873, I., 336 *seqq.*; GNOLI, *Cacce*, 18 *seqq.*; TOMASSETTI in *Arch. d. Soc. Rom.*, XXII., 478 *seqq.*; HARO, *De l'authenticité des fresques de Raphaël provenant de la Magliana*, Paris, 1873; OUDRY, *De l'hist. et de l'authenticité de la fresque de Raphaël: Le Père Eternel bénissant le monde*, provenant de la Magliana, Paris, 1873; MÜNTZ, *Raphaël*, 468 *seq.*; *Arch. stor. d. Arte*, III., 159. A special study is being prepared by the architect Barluzzi. See further, STEINMANN, II., 157, n. 6.

tilled floor of which remains, leads to the first floor, in the hall of which there used to be frescoes of Apollo and the Muses, now removed to the gallery of the Capitol. From the windows there is a beautiful view of the winding Tiber, and the undulations of the green Campagna extending to the Alban hills. The frescoes in the little chapel, representing on one side the martyrdom of St. Cecilia, and on the other God the Father blessing the world, are no longer there. The first has been destroyed, and the other taken to Paris. Nothing—not even a coat of arms—reminds us of the Medici Pope, whose favourite abode it was.\*

The chief reason of this was his absorption in the chase, for in the neighbourhood of Magliana was the Campo dei Merli, so favourable for sport. Round about the castle roamed wild pigs, deer, and hares, while the locality was equally favourable for the pursuit of herons and gulls.† As is shown by the register of his private accounts, the Pope's passion for the chase devoured large sums; nevertheless, his financial difficulties could never induce Leo X. to think of any retrenchments.‡ He paid not the slightest attention to the fact that his hunting pleasures, and still more the boisterous way in which they were carried out, were totally incompatible with sacerdotal gravity, and were contrary to canonical precept. Leo knew this well enough, for, at the request of King Emanuel, he had forbidden ecclesiastics to take part in the chase in Portugal, as being unsuited to their state.§ Such a contradiction between

\* Shortly before his death Leo X. began to build at Magliana; see GNOLI, 23. He also beautified the garden; see \*Serapica, Spese priv., III., 1521, Jan. 4: Payment "ali operarii hanno piantati limoni celsi a la Manliana." State Archives, Rome.

† GNOLI, 24. At the mouth of the Tiber at Ostia, Leo delighted in the French sport of netting (*loc. cit.*, 28).

‡ Cf. GNOLI, 9, 11, 14.

§ Corp. Dipl. Port., II., 26.

precept and practice produces a painful impression on the mind. Still more painful is it to contemplate the enormous cost of the festivals and theatrical performances arranged by Leo X.

The wonderful spectacle of the taking possession of the Lateran in 1513 gave the Romans a foretaste of what they might expect in the way of magnificence and extravagance from the new government. Just as the Romans then tried to outvie each other in splendour, so did they again, on a subsequent occasion, when the patriciate was conferred on the Pope's nephews, Giuliano and Lorenzo, in September, 1513. Leo had himself begged the Conservatori to bestow this dignity on his family. This act, which took place at the Capitol, secured, at one stroke, for the young nephews of the Pope, popularity with the Romans.

Few of the pageants which gratified the festal spirit of the Renaissance have been described with so much detail as this great gala, which filled Rome, from end to end, with excitement.\* On the morning of the 13th of September a deputation of fifty nobles waited on Giuliano — for

\* The principal accounts are : (1) Giuliano de' Medici eletto cittadino romano, ovvero il Natale di Roma nel 1513. Relazione di M. Ant. Altieri, ed. L. Pasqualucci, Roma, 1881 (edition of only 200 copies). (2) Le feste pel conferimento del patriziato romano a Giuliano e Lorenzo de' Medici narrate da Paolo Palliolo Fanese, ed. Guerrini, Bologna, 1885. Cf. JANITSCHKE, Das kapitol. Theater, i., J. 1513, in the Repert. für Kunstwiss., V., 259 *seqq.* (acc. to Altieri and the Cod. Vat., 5381); FLECHSIG, 51 *seq.* Both have overlooked a third account in the \*Cod. Barb., lat. 4793 (L. III., 31); see BUONAROTTI, 3rd Series, IV. (1891). Cf. VENUTI, Oratio, 139 *seqq.*; TIZIO in the Arch. d. Soc. Rom., III., 231 *seq.*; ALTIERI, Nuptiali, 118; Giorn. d. lett. Ital., VII., 269 *seqq.* The description by Pasqualucci (13), mentioned in the \*Cod. Vat., 5381, with the name of the author, is in the Communal Library at Perugia; see MAZZATINTI, VI., 147.

Lorenzo was absent—to take him in solemn procession to the Capitol. There a great surprise awaited him: overnight a theatre had been erected in the historic square in front of the Palace of the Senators. The wonderful building was made almost entirely of wood, but it had the appearance of being an antique monument and an architectural gem of rare beauty. The façade, with a great entrance in the centre, was copied from one of the Roman triumphal arches and decorated with paintings in imitation of antique bas-reliefs. The gallery, thirty-one metres in length, was bounded by a wall which gave it a magnificent appearance. Gilded pillars divided the wall into five parts: in each of these there was a doorway covered by a curtain of gold brocade. Above the doors was a frieze ornamented with vine-tendrils, sea-gods, and emblems of the Medici; above these again were five great paintings depicting the ancient friendship between the Romans and the Etruscans (Florentines). Besides these there were other historical pictures, one of them having been designed by Peruzzi.\*

Giuliano was received in this wonderful building by the Imperial Ambassador and the representatives of France, Spain, Milan, and Florence, the Despot of the Morea, and the Conservatori and magnates of the city. On the stage, facing the antique pictures, there was set up a richly-ornamented altar, where High Mass was sung, in order, says a contemporary, that the help of God might be invoked, as was fitting on such an occasion. Lorenzo Vallati and one of the Conservatori made speeches, to which Giuliano responded. This was followed by the solemn reading of a proclamation, written in letters of gold, by which the Senate and people of Rome gave to Giuliano and Lorenzo de' Medici, and their heirs, the rights of citizenship. The

\* Cf. FLECHSIG, 53 *seq.*, 55 *seq.*



day's solemnities terminated with a number of banquets. The Cardinals and higher prelates were entertained in the Palace of the Conservatori, and the lower ecclesiastics, nobles, singers, and actors, in the Palace of the Senators. But the banquet given to Giuliano, the Senators, and the Ambassadors was laid out on the stage of the theatre in view of the crowd who filled the arena. These also had their share in the choice food, which was carried round in extravagant profusion on magnificent silver plate. After the tables were cleared, an allegorical and pantomimic spectacle was given on the stage, with recitations in verse and an eclogue. To an accompaniment of music Roma appeared, along with Justice and Strength, while Cybele entered in a triumphal car, and Florentia on a lion.

The festivities of the second day consisted in similar representations, with the acting of the comedy of Plautus, "Pœnulus," in Latin. The actors, who were nearly all Roman nobles, were clad in silk, velvet, and cloth of gold, set with precious stones. The director of the play was the learned Tommaso Inghirami, who had drawn the designs for the painted decorations of the theatre.

Leo X. had not seen fit to be present at the ceremonial and brilliant festivals on the Capitol, the cost of which amounted to six thousand ducats.\* But he would not forego the pleasure of the celebration, and, on September the 18th, had everything repeated at the Vatican, in the presence of his relatives and the whole Court.† Nor, as far as was possible, did he fail to be present at the numerous feasts in the following year.‡ His interest in such things was so

\* SANUTO, XVII., 74.

† PALLIOLO, *loc. cit.*, 144; ALTIERI, *loc. cit.*, 54; SANUTO, XVII., 89; FLECHSIG, 59 *seq.*

‡ The opportunity for many feasts, and especially in 1514 for a brilliant Carnival, was given by the presence of Isabella d'Este in Rome; see

great that he was always kept closely informed about all the festivities which were going on outside.\*

A genuine Medici, Leo enjoyed the gay, fantastic doings and masquerades of the Carnival, as it came by year after year. He usually watched the fun from the Loggia of Julius II. in the Castle of St. Angelo.† In 1519 he remained there throughout the whole Carnival, returning to the Vatican only when necessary to hold a Consistory.‡ While at St. Angelo he sent for a famous company of actors from Siena, renowned for their boisterous comedies of peasant life.§

Theatrical pieces, brilliantly staged, with pleasant music and graceful dances, were among the Pope's favourite amusements, and under his patronage theatrical performances reached their zenith. Not only during the Carnival, but throughout the year, comedies were acted before him.||

LUZIO-RENIER, Mantova, 213 *seq.*; *cf.* LUZIO, Isabella d'Este, 51 *seq.*, 62 *seq.* About a Roman feast in 1515, see Repert. f. Kuntswissenschaft, XIV., 529; about another in 1519, see GAYE, Carteggio, I., 408 *seqq.*

\* See the \*Letter of Bald. da Pescia to Lorenzo, 1514, June 8 and 22. State Archives, Florence. GNOLI, Secolo di Leon X., 643 *seq.*

† *Cf.* ADEMOLLO, 71 *seqq.*; CLEMENTI, 158.

‡ SANUTO, XXVI., 509.

§ *Cf.*, with RUTH, II., 496 *seq.*, 504, MAZZI, La Congrega dei Rozzi di Siena nel sec. 16, I., Firenze, 1882, 66 *seq.* The Commedia di Pidinzuolo, played before Leo X. by the predecessors of the Rozzi, appeared in the Bibl. pop. Sanese curata da C. Mazzi, fasc. 3, Siena, 1891.

|| *Cf.* SANUTO, XXVI., 142, 469; XXVII., 68; XXVIII., 74; XXIX., 633; XXX. 188, 223; Angelo Germanello reports on August 5, 1520, to the Marquis of Mantua: \*La Sua Sta senne sta in castello e fuge li fastidii quanto po. El primo e secundo di de Augusto fece doi nobilissime cene e comedie e musiche, dove intervenero molti cardinali, ambasciatori e altri nobili. Gonzaga Archives, Mantua. Even during his country excursions Leo X. had plays and dances performed before him. *Cf.* \*Serapica, Spese priv. di Leone X., 1516, Oct. 22: A quelli

Next to hunting and music, Leo's passion was for the theatre. In his unbounded desire for pleasure he gave himself over in this respect to a wholly worldly pursuit; nor did he shrink from degrading his palace to the level of a theatre for the performance of the most unseemly comedies. In the autumn of 1514 he was present, amid great pomp, at the performance of "Calandria," an immoral piece, the representation of which, Cardinal Bibbiena, its author, had carried out in his own apartments, in honour of Isabella d'Este.\* The splendid scenery was painted by Baldassare Peruzzi.

On Carnival Sunday, in March, 1519, the Pope was present at another comedy, of like character, Ariosto's "Suppositi," which was put on the stage at St. Angelo by Cardinal Cibo, who was residing there. About two thousand spectators were admitted to a hall transformed into a large amphitheatre. Leo X. sat on a raised seat facing the stage, surrounded by Cardinals and Ambassadors. On the proscenium was a representation of "Fra Mariano teased by little devils." The classical description of the Ferrara Ambassador, Alfonso Paolucci, gives an idea of the play.† "When the audience was seated," he writes, "the pipers

che fecero la comedia in S. Severa duc. 6; October 24: A quelli che fecero la comedia [in S. Severa] duc. 10. Performers of the *moresca* were constantly employed, *cf.* April 2, 1520: Ali tre Francesi fanno la *moresca* duc. 63. Also on June 12, etc., Feb. 20, 1521: Duc. 25 per doi a quelli singari ferno la *morescha*. June 18, payment: A una donna che ballo. State Archives, Rome.

\* JOVIUS, Vita, l. 4; LUZIO-RENIER, Mantova, 214, n. *Cf.* Vol. V. of this work, 123 *seq.*

† Rome, March 8, 1519, first published by CAMPORI in Atti Mod., I., 111 *seq.*, then by CAPPELLI, Lettere di L. Ariosto, 3rd ed., Milano, 1887, clxxvi. *seqq.*, and lastly and best by ADEMOLLO, Il Carnevale di Roma, Roma, 1887, 88 *seqq.* *Cf.* the report of T. Lippomano in SANUTO, XXVII., 73. About the "Suppositi," *cf.* Vol. V. of this work, 123.

began to play, and the curtain was raised. During the music the Pope looked through his glass at the stage, on which Raphael had painted the town of Ferrara in perspective.\* Artistic candelabra, with five lights in each, were arranged to form the monogram of Leo X. First of all entered a messenger, who spoke the prologue and made jests about the title of the comedy, at which the Pope and those near him laughed heartily, though I understand that some Frenchmen were offended. The recitation of the comedy was excellent. Music was played between the acts, and among the other instruments used was a flute, and the little organ presented to the Pope by our dead Cardinal; the vocal music was less to be praised. During the last intermezzo the *moresca* (a kind of ballet) was danced, to illustrate the fable of the Gorgon: it was fine, but could not be compared with that at Your Highness's Court. Now the spectators began to leave the hall in such haste that I, being dragged over one of the rows of seats, was in danger of breaking my leg, a danger averted by the blessing of His Holiness. In the apartment where supper was prepared I met Cardinals Rangoni and Salviati; we spoke about Messer Ludovico Ariosto and how distinguished he was in his art. As I went away with Lanfranco Spinola, we remarked what a pity it was that such unbecoming plays should be represented before so noble a lord; this being especially the case in the beginning of the piece."†

\* Cf. FLECHSIG, 66 *seq.*

† Cf. REUMONT, III., I, 135 *seq.*, who pertinently remarks: "The fact of a Pope attending such plays publicly, caused scandal even in those days. But it would be to us an insoluble enigma did not other circumstances indicate a difference in the moral standpoint, which, when, as here, it meets us in the concrete, strikes us as something appalling. Just as Leo X. and his College of Cardinals, or at any rate



At the end of the evening Cardinal Cibo gave a banquet, to which the Pope, seventeen Cardinals, and several Ambassadors and prelates sat down. On Monday there took place a bull-fight in the Piazza of St. Peter's, in which several men lost their lives. The bull-fighters wore costly costumes given by the Pope, such as had not been given by any of the Cardinals; though a Venetian Ambassador regretted the good old days when Cardinal Petrucci had paid four thousand ducats for one such outfit. In the evening another play was acted in the presence of the Pope; and on Shrove Tuesday two were acted, one before, and another after, supper.\*

Yet the times were as anxious as they could well be. Regardless of this, and regardless of the scandal given by his presence at the acting of the "Suppositi," Leo X. urged its author to write another play. Thereupon Ariosto sent in the "Negromante." When this was produced, and it was perceived that the prologue cast ridicule on indulgences, and the abuses connected with them, the acting of it was discontinued.†

the younger members of it, did not seem to be scandalized by the indecent situations and rank obscenity of such plays, so were the latter popular at courts—such as that of Urbino in the last days of Guidobaldo da Montefeltro—which were looked upon as models, and with cultured princesses like Isabella Gonzaga, who could not see "Calandria" acted often enough, and had it produced with great pomp on the stage at Mantua in 1520."

\* SANUTO, XXVII., 73-74; *cf.* CLEMENTI, 159 *seqq.* On March 27, 1519, Serapica makes this note in his \**Spese private di Leon. X.*, II.: Duc. 48 per prezzo di 4 thori. State Archives, Rome.

† *Opere min. di ARIOSTO*, II., Firenze, 1857, 538, 559; CAMPANINI, L. Ariosto nei prologhi d. sue commedie, Bologna, 1891; GASPARY-ROSSI, II., I, 73, 76; FLAMINI, 269 *seqq.*; *Giorn. d. lett. Ital.*, XXXIII., 303 *seqq.*; GABOTTO, *Saggi crit.*, Venezia, 1888, 165 *seqq.*, and *Rassegna Emiliana*, V. (1889), 226 *seqq.*

The year 1520 opened with a grave outlook. To the complications of the political situation were added the affairs of Luther, and in addition to these came the death of Alfonsina Orsini on the 6th of February. Notwithstanding this, Leo X. made no change in his wonted habits. He had comedies played during the Carnival, and watched day by day from the ramparts of St. Angelo the antics of the masqueraders.\* Far from discouraging its observance, the Carnival of 1520 was kept with unusual brilliancy. "Every day," writes a contemporary, "we have a fresh entertainment; and in the evening theatrical and musical performances in the presence of the Pope." In the town the usual races were varied by bull-fights, and the ordinary barbarous sports, dating from the Middle Ages, took place on Monte Testaccio, where cars full of pigs were tumbled headlong from the summit to be scrambled for by the people below.

In front of St. Angelo a mimic fight was held on a wooden fortification. The Papal household were given special costumes, and fought with oranges, which amused the Pope so much that he had the fight repeated next day in front of the palace.† The principal civic pageant which, in accordance with traditional custom, was always held in

\* \*El papa sennesta in castello tucto el dì ad vedere le mascare et omne sera se fa recitar comedie, et domane el S<sup>r</sup> Camillo Ursino ad la presentia de la sua S<sup>ta</sup> deve contrahere li sponsalitii con una figliola de Joanpaulo Baglione. Hore è morta madonna Alphonsina cugnata del papa in Roma in la casa del papa quando era in minoribus. . . . Angelo Germanello to the Marquis of Mantua from Rome, Feb. 7, 1520. Pandolfo Pico della Mirandola also writes thus on the 18th of February: \*N. S<sup>re</sup> sta in Castello per veder passar maschare. Gonzaga Archives, Mantua.

† With SANUTO, XXVIII., 277 *seqq.*, *cf.* the Report of Michiel in CICOGLIA, 407 *seqq.* See also ALTIERI, Nuptiali, 113, 122, and the \*Diary in the Cod. Barb., lat. 3552, Vatican Library.

the Piazza Navona \* on Carnival Thursday (Giovedì grasso), was celebrated with close adherence to ancient style. It surpassed anything of the kind seen hitherto.† A great triumphal procession set forth from the Capitol, passing through the Via de' Banchi to St. Angelo, from which the Pope looked on; it then proceeded to the Piazza of St. Peter's, and finally wound back to the Piazza Navona, arriving there towards dusk. In the procession were thirteen cars with representations of Italia, Isis (taken from an ancient statue in possession of the Pope), Neptune, Hercules, Atlas, Æolus, Vulcan, the Tiber, and the Capitoline She-wolf. Alexander the Great, on horseback, figured in the procession as well as two camels which had been presented to Leo X. Lastly came a globe surmounted by an angel, which was meant to symbolize the triumph of religion. The cars were accompanied by two hundred youths in ancient costumes, representing the various guilds and districts of the city, with their banners.‡ On another occasion Leo X. arranged that the girls who had been presented with their dowries at Pentecost should also take part in the procession, clad in semi-antique costumes.§ Antiquity laid its stamp on everything. Can we wonder

\* In 1514 there were interesting political allusions, see SANUTO, XVIII., 14 *seq.* The description which is to be found in the \*Cod. Vat., 3351, f. 175*b*, and is made use of by JANITSCHKE in *Repert.* II., 416 *seq.*, apparently belongs to 1515; it mentions artists hitherto unknown working in Rome under Leo X. *Cf.* *Giorn. d. erudiz. artist.* IV., 4, 116.

† With SANUTO, XXVIII., 277, and Michiel (see *supra*, p. 174 n.), *cf.* the \*Report of Germanello, Feb. 19, 1520 (Gonzaga Archives, Mantua), in Appendix, No. 15.

‡ \*Le feste di Nagone con li carri sono stati più pomposi che mai vedesse alter volte, writes Pandolfo Pico della Mirandola on Feb. 18 1520. Gonzaga Archives, Mantua.

§ SANUTO, XXVII., 468.

that even a Dominican should compare Leo X. with the Sun-god? \*

The Carnival of 1521 found Leo X. once more at St. Angelo. In spite of the menacing state of the world, he was able to enjoy himself more than ever with masquerades, music, theatrical performances, dances, and sham fights. All business remained at a standstill.† In the evening of Carnival Sunday (Quinquagesima), some Siense actors came before the Court at St. Angelo to dance a *moresca* which Baldassare Castiglione has described.‡ The Pope and those with him looked at it from a window. The courtyard, where a tent of dark-green satin was put up, was used as a stage.

The play began with the entrance of a woman, who, in graceful verse, prayed to Venus to send her a lover. On this, to the sound of drums, there appeared eight hermits clad in grey tunics. These danced, and began to drive away a Cupid, who had appeared on the stage with his quiver. Cupid, in tears, prayed Venus to deliver him out of the hands of the hermits, who had snatched away his

\* See *infra*, p. 214.

† Cf. SANUTO, XXIX., 633, 651; CLEMENTI, 167-168. In the \*letter of Castiglione, quoted in the next note, it is said: "Il vero è che N. S. è stato questi di occupato in feste di modo che non si è potuto attendere a negocio alcuno."

‡ The very interesting letter of Castiglione to the Marquis of Mantua, dated Rome, il primo di Quaresima, 1521, has been twice printed entire, and recently in part in LUZIO-RENIER, 325 *seqq.* The first complete edition appeared as a *Nozze-publ.* under the title of: Lettera di B. Castiglione a F. Gonzaga, ora per la prima volta messa in pubblico da Anton Enrico Mortara: Casalmaggiore, 1851. But it was not issued, as the marriage did not take place. Later the same letter was published by C. Loria as "finora inedita" per le auspici. nozze Loria-Maroni: Lettera inedita di B. Castiglione, Mantova, 1861. This document also is a bibliographical rarity.



bow. Thereupon Venus appeared, and, calling to her, the love-sick woman bade her give the hermits a charmed potion, which sent them all to sleep. Cupid now took back his bow, and waked up the hermits with his arrows; they danced round Cupid and made declarations of love to the woman, and finally, casting away their grey tunics, they appeared as comely young men. When they had performed a *moresca*, the woman commanded them to make proof of their weapons; a combat then ensued, in which seven of them were killed, the survivor receiving the woman as the prize of victory.

Had not this been related by an absolutely trustworthy witness, it would seem incredible. So far did the irresponsible frivolity of Leo X. carry him, that, at the very time when Luther's case was being dealt with before the Diet of Worms, and when many monks in sympathy with the reformer were breaking their vows and entering wedlock, this sort of trifling could be enacted on the stage under the Pope's very eyes, and be made almost matter for encomium. No wonder that, to the north of the Alps, the opposition to the Papacy daily increased in strength and that the cry for reform in head and members sounded louder and louder, or that the most venomous accusations of Hutten, Luther, and many other bitter enemies of the Roman See in Germany met with a ready response from thousands and thousands of malcontents, so that many despaired of the survival of the Papacy.

How widespread the danger was is made clear by the fact that the flames of a passionate antagonism from the most opposite quarters of Christendom were on the point of kindling the heap of inflammable material which had been piling itself up for centuries. Not only was a large portion of Germany ready to sever the bonds which had united it to Rome for a thousand years, but in Italy the

upper and middle classes were in a ferment of hostility to the secularized Papacy.

It is true that only some individuals went as far as Machiavelli in desiring the destruction of the whole institution of the Papacy, as the root of all evil. Nevertheless, year after year, the voices which pointed out the unnatural preponderance of purely secular tendencies in the Roman Court increased in volume and in number. The startling contrast between the apostolic simplicity and purity of the early days of Christianity, with the worldliness of the Church as it then existed, was drawn out in attractive antitheses by Francesco Vettori, whose relations with the house of Medici were most intimate.\*

The historian Guicciardini, after having served Leo X. and Clement VII. faithfully for long years, broke out into violent accusations against Rome, and cherished the hope that Luther might bring about the destruction of the ecclesiastical polity. A passage in his "Aphorisms" shows the bitter hatred which filled his soul. He wrote at a time (1529) when the consequences of Luther's movements could in a great measure be surveyed as a whole. "To no man," says he, "is it more displeasing than to me, to see the ambition, covetousness, and excesses of priests, not only because all wickedness is hateful in itself, but because, taken generally and individually, such wickedness should find no place in men whose state of life implies a special relationship to God. Also, they are so divided one from the other that it is only in particular individuals that the spirit of unity can be found. At the same time, my relations with several Popes have made me desire their greatness at the expense of my own interest. Had it not been for this consideration, I would have loved Martin Luther as myself; not that I might set myself free from the laws imposed on us by

\* VETTORI, 304.

Christianity, as it is commonly interpreted and understood, but that I might see this flock of good-for-nothings (*questa caterva di scelerati*) confined within due limits, so that they might be forced to choose between a life without crime or a life without power." \*

It must be remembered that Guicciardini's anti-Papal opinions are manifestly connected with his belief that man must of necessity remain in the dark in respect of supernatural things.† His enmity to the Catholic Church cannot therefore cause surprise. But the same is more remarkable in the case of really believing Italians, amongst whom we find equally severe expressions about the secularization of higher and lower ecclesiastics. The Milanese chronicle of Giovanni Andrea Prato contains very strongly-worded passages to this effect, directed especially against those monks who, "having nothing, yet possessed everything." The severe judgments of Prato gain in importance if we realize his pregnant saying that, from respect for the keys, he desires to keep silence about the Pope.‡

Another chronicler, the Florentine Bartolomeo Cerretani (*ob.* 1524), though an adherent of the Medici, sets forth the necessity of reform in an imaginary dialogue between some Florentine friends, followers, and adversaries of Savonarola in which the condition of the Church is painted in the darkest colours, and the necessity for reform is emphasized. Cerretani's hopes of salvation were placed in no other than Martin Luther. In him he hails a man distinguished equally for morals, learning, and piety, whose views are penetrated by the ideas of the ancient Church, and whose writings are marked by a true and solid learning.

\* Ricordi, n. 28, in *Opere ined.*, I., 97.

† *Cf.* BURCKHARDT, II., 7th ed., 187; *cf.* MONNIER, *Quattrocento*, I., Paris, 1901, 88, and *Riv. Europea*, XIII., Firenze, 1879, 36 *seqq.*

‡ *Cf.* PRATO, 310, 322, 404, 405.

The date of Cerretani's Dialogue is 1520, when the later developments of Lutheranism were still unknown. Still, the Bull *Exsurge* was known to him, and had in no way affected his deep sympathy with the German professor. In spite of the Papal condemnation, he still believed that from Luther would come the ardently desired reform of the Church.\*

Even in Rome, in a treatise dedicated to Leo X. himself, Mario Salomoni, professor of jurisprudence, complains about the simony which prevailed, the wars carried on by the Pope, and the worldliness of the Curia. Nevertheless, like Dante and Prato, respect for the keys made him speak with reverence and reserve about the Supreme Head of the Church. This does not prevent him from remarking that, although the Pope, as bearer of the highest dignity on earth, can be judged of no man, even for the misuse of his authority, he cannot escape the judgment of God.†

Especially remarkable are the casual opinions of really ecclesiastically minded contemporaries, such as are to be found in the still unprinted chronicle of the Sienese canon, Sigismondo Tizio, who was deeply disgusted by the Pope's unceasing demands for money. Here we have evidence of the offence caused by Leo's worldly actions among those who, in spite of such disorders, remained in all essentials faithful members of the Church.

Most of Tizio's complaints concern the impoverishment of the clergy by the Pope's insatiable demands for money and his frivolous generosity.‡ Here he agrees with many

\* Cf. SCHNITZER, Quellen und Forsch. zur Gesch. Savonarolas III. B. Cerretani, München, 1904, XLII., *seqq.*, 83 *seqq.*

† Cf. CIAN'S interesting treatise, Un trattatista del "Principe" a tempo di Machiavelli : Mario Salomoni, Torino, 1900, 16-18 ; cf. Giorn. d. lett. Ital., XXXVII., 454 *seq.*

‡ Cf. PICCOLOMINI, Tizio, 128.



of his contemporaries in Italy as well as Germany, in severely condemning abuses in the matter of indulgences, as well as Leo's military enterprises.\* He is sometimes led away into making complaints of a more general nature, which fall little short of the worst examples of German hostility. Tizio's indignation is vented most heavily on the striking contrast between the high and noble task inherent in the Papacy and the inconceivable want of appreciation of this task in those who held the highest ecclesiastical positions.† Nevertheless, Tizio never dreams of renouncing obedience to the Roman See, nor does he in any way give ear to Luther's new doctrines. He considers Luther a very learned man, but utterly condemns his opinions as false. In this he, unlike Cerretani, takes up a strong and thoroughly sound Catholic position. The clear line drawn by Tizio between persons and things is very remarkable. Amid all his indignation against the needy and pleasure-seeking Pope, he always finds a word of excuse to say for him, as, *e.g.*, when he is describing Leo's love of buffoonery, he remarks that the Florentines kept everything sad, or even anything relating to the affairs of the Church, away from the Pope. It is, however, true that in his concluding sentence there is a note of severity: "In his delight in such jests and amusements the Pope forgets himself, and thinks not of the burden which rests on his shoulders. Neither does he give a thought to what is the will of God, to the dangers threatening the Church in Germany, to the growth of error, or to the severe decrees of Councils."‡

Expressions such as these show that in Italy also, anti-Papal opinions were more widespread than has been

\* Cf. Vol. VII. of this work, p. 350, and *supra*, p. 61 n.

† Cf. Vol. VII. of this work, p. 6, and PICCOLOMINI, 120.

‡ TIZIO, Hist Senen. in Cod. G, II., 39, f. 12, Chigi Library, Rome.

generally supposed. Still the anti-Papal movement there was but limited compared with what it was to the north of the Alps. Various causes contributed to this; in no other country was the whole life of the people bound up with that of the Church as it was in Italy; the Catholic Faith had taken the deepest root there. It is true that the people were not blind to the transgressions of the clergy of all degrees; but nowhere was such a clear line drawn between persons and offices. There was a general conviction among the Italians that, in the same way that a bad setting does not take from the value of a precious stone, so no sinfulness on the part of the priest affects in any essential manner either the sacrifice he offers, the sacraments he dispenses, or even the doctrine he teaches. The people knew that gold remains gold whether the hand which gives it be clean or unclean.

There were also other very material reasons which prevented Italians of the day from even contemplating a breach with the Papacy. To most it was a matter of no small pride that the centre of Western Christendom should have been established in their country; to a great number of others it was of the utmost importance that the existing order should be preserved.\* A fact which, moreover, had a very great influence, especially on the educated classes, was that, for at least half a century, the Papacy had taken on itself the position of leader in the field of art and learning.

\* See BURCKHARDT, I. 7th ed., 110.

## CHAPTER V.

THE RENAISSANCE IN THE FIELD OF LITERATURE.—BEMBO AND SADOLETO—VIDA AND SANNAZARO.

A PECULIAR fascination is connected with the very name of Medici. Whenever literature and art are mentioned, it comes at once before us as the representative symbol of the world of culture. When Cardinal Giovanni de' Medici was raised to the See of Peter, this opinion was already so generally prevalent, that his election was hailed by the whole educated world with the greatest rejoicing. The son of Lorenzo the Magnificent would restore peace to the world, and at the same time introduce a golden age for scholars, poets, and artists. Far and wide the conviction was entertained that the pupil of Poliziano, who, as Cardinal, had shown, even under grave difficulties, his lively interest in knowledge and art, would, now that he was master of the means of the Papacy, put into practice the brilliant aims and traditions of his family.

When he took solemn possession of the Lateran, the city was covered with inscriptions which proclaimed the dawn of the age of Pallas Athene. The very ruggedness of Julius II., and the asperity of his rule, made men look for a reaction in the pontificate of his successor, and men of education confidently expected that to the stormy pontificate of the founder of the States of the Church there would succeed an age of peace, in which the highly-cultivated Medici Pope would do homage to the Muses alone.

Desire gave birth to the conviction that the peace-loving Medici would follow the warlike Rovere like Numa after Romulus.\*

Aldus Manutius, the indefatigable and learned publisher of Greek and Latin classics, reminded the Pope, in his first edition of Plato, how science had been promoted by Nicholas V. and Lorenzo the Magnificent. It behoved the exalted successor of the one, and son of the other, to complete what a premature death had prevented his predecessors from accomplishing.†

The first acts of the new Pontificate—in which Leo X. declared that he had loved the fine arts from his earliest years, and had grown up among books,‡ and wished to attract to Rome as many distinguished men as possible§—were calculated to satisfy the exaggerated expectations which had been formed. The appointment of the celebrated Latinists Bembo and Sadoletto to be the Pope's private secretaries, and the summoning to Rome of the great Greek scholar Giano Lascaris, the foundation of a College for the study of Greek, and, finally, the reorganization of the Roman University, filled the whole literary world with a joyous excitement. From all sides, poets, literary and learned men, gathered round the Pope, who,

\* Cf. FABRONIUS, 36 *seq.*; ROSCOE-BOSSI, IV., 93 *seq.*; BURCKHARDT, Kultur, I., 7th ed., 243. See also VOLPICELLA, Heroica Marci Ant. Casanovae, Napoli, 1867, 15, 37; VAST, Lascaris, 79. It is remarkable to see how the poet and archæologist, Andrea Fulvio, in his work dedicated to Leo X., regards the Pontificate of Julius II., as a mere interruption in the growth of study. CIAN first drew attention to this in the Giorn. d. lett. Ital., XXIX., 435.

† ROSCOE-BOSSI, V., 298; LEGRAND, I., 100 *seqq.*

‡ “Nos qui ab incunabulis bonas artes dileximus et in bibliothecis per omnem aetatem versati fuimus.” Brief, Aug. 24, 1513, Regest. Leonis X., n. 4202.

§ Cf. RATTI, Lettera, 13.



with an unparalleled generosity, showered on them his gifts and tokens of favour. The laudatory poem of Angelo Colocci was rewarded with four hundred ducats, and another by Tebaldeo with five hundred;\* poets also of no importance were likewise liberally rewarded.† All these acts were blazoned far and wide in letters and poems; Leo's generosity was described as unparalleled and incredible; past ages had never known anything like it, and remotest posterity would speak of it.‡ "At last," said an epigram affixed to Pasquino, clad as Apollo, "at last I am recalled from banishment; for Leo reigns, who will not leave poets unrecompensed."§ Instances, both true and untrue, of the Pope's liberality were circulated, and a kind of legendary lore about his patronage of literature grew up. To this belongs the story of the purple velvet purses filled with packets of gold of different sizes, into which the fortunate successor of the rugged Julius plunged his hand blindly, to give to the men of letters who drew near to him.|| The fact of the case was that Serapica, the confidential treasurer of the Pope, kept a rigid account of all his lord's expenditure.¶

\* GNOLI, *Secolo di Leone X.*, II., 632.

† No poem, says Giovio (*Vita Leonis X.*, lib. 4), was too insignificant to taste of the Pope's liberality. This is a rare piece of praise.

‡ Cf. the poem in ROSCOE-HENKE, III., 601-602.

§ GNOLI, *Storia di Pasquino*, 283.

|| "Purpuream etenim crumenam quotidie aureis nummis sibi replei iubebat ad incertas exercendae liberalitatis occasionis." JOVIUS, *Vita*, lib. 4. Cf. GIRALDI, *Hecatomithi*, VI., Nov. 8, and BURCKHARDT, *Kultur*, I., 3rd ed., 266, 345.

¶ Cf. *supra*, p. 210. To this legendary tale equally belongs the story, so often told by older writers, of Leo's reward to Giovanni Aurelio Augurelli, whom he had charged to write a poem on the art of making money: he presented him with an empty sack, saying that a man who knew how to make money needed nothing but a purse to put it into.

Rome became now more than ever the centre of the literary world. "On all sides," writes Cardinal Riario, who built the Cancelleria, in a letter to Erasmus in July, 1515, "literary men flock to the Eternal City as to their mother country, foster-mother and patron."\* Nowhere was intellect so encouraged as in Rome; and in no other place were there so many openings to be found for talent as in the numerous offices of the Curia, and in the brilliant households of Cardinals and rich bankers. For it was not only in the immediate entourage of the Pope, but also in that of the Cardinals and other great personages of Roman society, that the composers of elegant letters, polite addresses, devices, mottoes, festal programmes and verses, found advancement. This connection of men of letters with great houses, though it dates back to former Pontificates, received a new development under Leo X.

In surveying the throng of authors who frequented the Rome of Leo X., we are surprised at the unusual proportion among them of poets. Many of these had come to the Eternal City in the time of Julius II., and had in this, as in other ways, paved the way for the influence of the Medici;† for under Leo X. the number of poets in Rome was almost beyond calculation.

The admirers of antiquity had a decided predilection for the new Latin poetry; and however much a servile imitation of the ancients might prevail in this, there nevertheless came into existence some original creations. Every kind of poetry—epic, mythological, bucolic and didactic, as well as lyrics and epigrams—was cultivated. The standard of

*Cf.* Monograph of PAVANELLO, *Un maestro del Quattrocento*, Venezia, 1905, 186 *seqq.*

\* ERASMI Opera ep., 180.

† GNOLI rightly emphasises this, *Secolo*, II., 628 *seq.*

the ancients was most closely approached in the latter. Next to classical themes, the favourite subjects were drawn from sacred history and contemporary events. The occurrences, great and small, which took place in the reign of Leo X., such as his election, the taking possession of the Lateran, the conferring of the rights of citizenship on the Pope's nephews, the embassy and gifts of the King of Portugal, the arrival of manuscripts, deaths in the Sacred College, the Council of the Lateran and the proposed war against the Turks, were frequently treated by the poets, even such matters as the Pope's hunting expeditions not being overlooked. The artists also and their works of art, patronized by Leo, furnished subjects for many verses to the indefatigable poets. So also did any important ecclesiastical function, and even the visits of the Pope to various churches. No prince mentioned in history has had the events of his life recorded and extolled to the same extent as Leo X.\* Without weighing the merits or demerits of these poets, Leo dispensed his favours indiscriminately, drawing no line between men of profound learning and real poets, and skilful improvisatori, poetasters, and jesters of the most ordinary kind.† The more he gave the more greedy were the poets; even if the good-natured

\* Besides BURCKHARDT, *Kultur*, I., 3rd ed., 266, *cf.* the numerous instances recorded in ROSCOE-HENKE, II., 53, 59, 65, 169, 271, 412 *seq.*, 415, 441 *seq.*; III., 535 *seq.*, 554 *seq.*, 586 *seq.*, 594 *seq.*, 602 *seq.*, 612 *seq.* A remarkable poem on the Turkish question, printed at the expense of Leo X., is in the Chigi Library, Rome: *Carmina de certo Turcar. || adventu non credito || cum exhortatione || ad arma in eos su || scipienda per || Ioan. Bapti || stam Catha || neum ||*, *s. l. et a.*, 9 sheets. An Italian poem, still unprinted, on the assistance sent by Leo X. in 1520 to Rhodes against the Turks, is in the State Archives, Florence; see *Carte Strozzi*, II., 812.

† *Cf. supra*, p. 151 *seq.*

Pope invited them collectively to his table, or asked them to recite their compositions on certain special occasions,\* or even gave them free access to his presence at noon, they were not satisfied. The "unabashed swarm of poets" pursued Leo everywhere; even in his bedchamber he was not safe from these tormenters whom he had himself called into existence.† Naturally the Pope was unable to satisfy everyone, and as he fell deeper and deeper into financial difficulties, the voices which clamoured for favours sounded louder and louder.‡ To these discontented spirits belonged that poet who proclaimed that the ancients were fortunate, because they were provided with great patrons. If it is, as a rule, a mistake to give full credence to authors with a grievance, we must certainly refuse to accept this last implied accusation as unjust, "for rarely have poetical talents basked in a brighter sun than they did in the time of Leo X."§

Besides the bestowal of gifts in money, the Pope rewarded literary men with positions in the Curia, and benefices, as well as other favours, such as patents of nobility, the rank of count and other titles of honour.|| He also repeatedly helped them by giving them letters of

\* We read of this occurring on the feast of the patron saints of the Medici, SS. Cosmas and Damian. \*Et post haec (the Mass) dedit epulum omnibus cardinalibus et principibus et infinitis curialibus ac Romanis solemne, post quod recitata sunt multa festiviter carmina latina et vulgaria. Paris de Grassis, ad a., 1514, XII., 23. Secret Archives of the Vatican.

† Valerianus, Sermo cui titulus est Simia ad Leonem X., in ROSCOE-HENKE, II., 422.

‡ GNOLI, Secolo, III., 42 *seqq.*

§ Such is the opinion of GREGOROVIVS, VII., 323-324. Cf. ROSCOE-BOSSI, VII., 219, and especially CESAREO, 199.

|| Regest. Leonis X., n. 8339-8383. For other instances see *infra*.



recommendation to princes and others in high spiritual or secular positions.\*

After the Vatican the principal place of meeting of literati and poets was the villa of the wealthy Angelo Colocci, built on the ruins of Sallust's villa, and full of rare manuscripts, books, antiquities, and inscriptions. Colocci, who was at the head of the Roman Academy, had been appointed by Leo X. to be his secretary, and had been generously remunerated by him for his poems; later he received the reversion of the bishopric of Nocera.†

Another favourite meeting-place of the Roman poets was the vineyard near Trajan's Forum, belonging to the old receiver of petitions, Johann Goritz. This native of Luxemburg, who was, however, quite italianized, was extolled by Erasmus as "a man of pure heart." Every year, on the Feast of St. Anne, he gave a feast to his literary friends, who expressed their gratitude in verses written in his honour, which were presented to him either at his vineyard or at the Chapel in S. Agostino, founded by him, which has been made famous by Sansovino's group of the Divine Infant with His Mother and St. Anne. In the collection of

\* See, for example, the letter to the Doge, composed by Sadoleto, in which the poet Francesco Modesto (*cf.* TIRABOSCHI, VII., 2, 279, Modena edition, which is used in the following), is recommended; printed by SANUTO, XXIV., 474-475. *Cf.* BEMBI, *epist.*, IX., 2; ROSCOE-BOSSI, VII., 12.

† *Cf.* LANCELLOTTI, *Vita di A. Colocci* (Poesie, ed. Jesi, 1772); TIRABOSCHI, VII., 3, 181 *seq.*; BLUME, III., 190; ROSSI, *Pasquinate*, 112; NOLHAC, F. Orsini, 249 *seq.*; LANCIANI, 202 *seq.*; C. GIOIA, *Gli orti Colocciani in Roma, Foligno*, 1893. Many Briefs, composed by Colocci, still unprinted and missing in Hergenröther's Register, are to be found in the *Regest. Brevium Lateran.* (Secret Archives of the Vatican), transcribed in the autumn of 1904; see especially tom. V.: *Brevia Leonis X.*, I., 1514-1518.

these poems, which Blosio Palladio, so celebrated for the elegance of his verses, gathered together and published in the first poetical annual, which appeared in 1524, we meet with the works of celebrated men such as Bembo, Castiglione, Vida, and Flaminio, interspersed with the productions of men quite unknown to fame.\* We see this still more in the collection of Roman poets made by the physician Francesco Arsilli, and appended to the above collection.† If to these we add the statements of Giovio, Giraldi,‡ and

\* Coryciana, Romae, 1524, a copy of which is in the Bibl. Vittorio Emanuele. Cf. GEIGER'S fine essay on the "oldest poetical annual" in the *Zeitschr. f. Renaiss.*, I., 145. See ROSCOE-BOSSI, VII., 211 *seq.*; VIII., 214 *seq.*; SCHÖNFELD, Sansovino, 21 *seq.*, 24 *seq.*; Aleander's autobiography, ed. Paquier, 17 *seq.*; PAQUIER, Vita Beroaldi, 35; LANCIANI, 202 *seq.* About Blosio Palladio, see BORGIA, Anecd. litt., II., 167 *seq.*; GREGOROVIVS, *Schriften*, I., 289 (Bürgerrecht für Blosio), and CIAN in the *Giorn. stor. d. lett.*, XVII., 281-282, XLV., 67 *seq.* About Goritz and his circle, cf. GNOLI, Pasquino, 69 *seq.*; PAQUIER, Aléandre, 113, and Vita Beroaldi, 77 *seq.* Cf. also Regest. Leonis X., n. 15464-15465.

† Fr. Arsilli Senogalliensis de poetis urbanis ad P. Iovium libellus, in TIRABOSCHI, VII., 3, 425-442, with the readings of the first edition in the Coryciana. Arsilli, who was one of the discontented poets mentioned above (see *supra*, p. 188), avoided all mention of Leo X. In one of his epigrams he speaks of Julius II. as if he were still living; see GNOLI, *Secolo*, II., 628, cf. III., 45. Gnoli is right, as against Tiraboschi, in putting the version published by the latter at a later date than that of Coryciana. ROSCOE-BOSSI (VII., 225) takes the second edition as his basis, and gives many explanatory notes on p. 248 *seq.*

‡ LILIUS GREGORIUS GYRALDUS, *De poetis nostrorum temporum*, published by K. Wotke, Berlin, 1894. Cf. RASS., *Bibl. d. lett. Ital.*, III., 133 *seq.*, 220, and B. ROSSI'S ingenious treatment in the *Giorn. d. lett. Ital.*, XXXVII., 246 *seqq.* In 1514, Giraldi came to Rome with his disciple Ercole Rangoni and soon gained the favour of Leo. X. He was one of the markedly Christian humanists. In his first dialogue he condemned, with remarkable severity, the immoral subject-matter and lasciviousness of the poems, put forth under Leo X.

Pierio Valeriano,\* we have a more or less perfect picture of the poetical circle of Leo X.†

Undoubtedly the first place as writers, both of prose and poetry, must be given to Bembo‡ and Sadoleto. By his appointment of these two representatives of true, pure, Ciceronian style to be his secretaries and domestic prelates,§ Leo proclaimed his determination that the writings issued from his chancery should be distinguished for the elegance of their Latinity. Bembo and Sadoleto were intimate friends. Both had previously enjoyed the favour of Julius II.,|| and now they together obtained a position near his successor as distinguished as it was important and responsible. The choice of these two celebrated Latinists is therefore to the credit of Leo, being, as they were, such a marked contrast to the others who represented the intellectual life of the time.

Bembo has been declared by many to have been a pagan. This judgment is most certainly unjust,¶ though it is not

\* I. P. VALERIANUS, *De infelicitate litteratorum*, Venetiae, 1620 (also in the *Giorn. d. lett.*, III., Venezia, 1710). About P. Valeriano, see BUSTICO in the *Atti d. Accad. di Rovereto*, 3rd Series, XI.

† It is impossible to give here a complete list of the poets and literati of the Rome of Leo X. Among the poets, the improvisatori (see *supra*, p. 149 *seq.*) may be in a certain sense included. But, on the other hand, for local reasons and because they lived in Rome for only a short time, such men as Marc Antonio Flaminio (*cf.* CUCCOLI, 29 *seqq.*) cannot be included.

‡ Unfortunately there is no biography of Bembo which comes up to modern requirements. CIAN made a beginning in this direction in his book, written in his usual masterly way, *Un decennio di vita di M. P. Bembo*, Torino, 1885, in which (p. 1 n. 1) he gives details of earlier biographies.

§ Thus are they both styled in the \**Rotulus* of 1514; see *Quellen und Forschungen des preuss. Instituts*, VI., 56.

|| About Bembo, see Vol. VI. of this work, p. 457 n.

¶ *Cf.* *Rev. hist.*, XXXII., 214.

to be denied that the intellectual Venetian, so full of the love of life, belonged avowedly to that portion of the humanist school the representatives of which lived in a state of moral depravity and undisguised devotion to the ancient world, troubling themselves but little with the precepts of Christianity.\* However lax Bembo's conduct may have been, it does not follow that he held infidel opinions;† better feelings were latent within him, which came to light later in his life. Nor must it be forgotten that at this time Bembo was only in minor orders; he received sacred orders only in 1539, when he was nominated Cardinal.‡

Although Bembo was well paid as Papal secretary, he, like many others, was very eager to obtain benefices,§ the incomes of which would enable him to lead a brilliant and luxurious life. Some of his wealth was applied to nobler objects. He was a zealous collector of manuscripts, books, and works of art, both ancient and modern: among these last were the portraits by Raphael of Navagero, Beazzano, and of Bembo himself, besides paintings by Memlinc,

\* Bembo lived for twenty-two years in an unlawful connection with the beautiful Morosina, who bore him several children, and whose death was bitterly bewailed by him; see MAZZUCHELLI, II., 2, 740, and CIAN, Decennio, 14 *seq.*; *cf.* RATTI in the Giorn. d. lett., XL., 335 *seqq.* It is characteristic of the time that no one should seem to have taken scandal at such a connection. About Bembo's children, *cf.* the \*Letters to Bembo in Cod. Barb., LXI., 3, Vatican Library.

† See MORSOLIN, *La ortodossia di P. Bembo*, Venezia, 1885; *cf.* CIAN, Decennio, 20, and Giorn. stor. d. lett. Ital., V., 433 *seq.*

‡ *Cf.* CIAN, Decennio, 15.

§ See Regest. Leonis X., n. 2741 *seq.*, 5029, 5139 *seq.*, 7768, 7905, 13,708, 14,869, 17,208; MAZZUCHELLI, II., 2, 739, 742; PINTON, *P. Bembo, Canonico Saccense*, Roma, 1892; Giorn. stor. d. lett. Ital., XIX., 443; \*Brief, dated Viterbo, 1518, Sept. 30 (sup. canonicatu et prae-benda eccles. Bellunen.); Arm., XXXIX., t. 31; \*Brief, May 24, 1518 (Benefizium in Foligno), *ibid.* Secret Archives of the Vatican.



Mantegna, Bellini, and Sebastiano del Piombo.\* His strong affection for the antique was manifested by many indecent poems written in his youth, and also by a few letters written from Rome to his friend Bibbiena, in which he asks him to procure for him a statue of Venus, to be placed in his study alongside those of Jupiter and Mercury, the father and brother of the foam-born goddess.†

Leo X. had shown his favour to Bembo as early as October, 1513, by appointing him Notary of the Apostolic See and "S. Pal. et aulae Lateran. comes." ; ‡ on the 1st of January, 1515, he gave him the name and arms of the Medici, § and on several occasions confided diplomatic missions to him. || But the chief task which was confided to this perfect stylist was that of composing the Papal letters. If we look at the private correspondence carried on by Bembo ¶ with nearly all the celebrities of the time,

\* About Bembo's Library, see, besides NOLHAC, F. Orsini, 92 *seq.*, 183 *seq.*, 236 *seq.*, 278 *seq.*, 325 *seq.*, especially CIAN, *Decennio*, 102 *seq.*, in which more details are given about the collections of Bembo, which were only begun in Rome. See also JANITSCHKE, 95. Agostino Beazzano, also a poet, served Bembo as secretary. CIAN, *Cortegiano*, 216.

† BEMBO, *Opere*, III., Venezia, 1729, 12, 14, 205.

‡ Regest. Leonis X., n. 5139-5140; *cf.* Giorn. d. lett. Ital., XIX., 382.

§ See Appendix, No. 4, for the document which is missing in Hergenröther's Register.

|| MAZZUCHELLI, II., 2, 739.

¶ About the editions of Bembo's letters, see MAZZUCHELLI, II. 2, 763 *seq.* See in the third volume, Venetian edition of 1729, the *Lettere volgari*, and in the fourth volume the *Epist. lat.* Supplements are given by Malagola in the periodical *Il Baretto*, Torino, 1875. Many other letters are scattered about in stray publications. Without attempting to make the list complete, I will here name: Bembo, *Lettere inedite o rare*, Padova, 1852. *Lettere inedite del Card. Bembo tratte dai codici d. Marciana*, Venezia, 1855; *cf.* Arch. storia Ital., N. S., II., 1. 242 *seqq.* *Lettere ined. del Card. Bembo e di altri scritt. pubbl. da S.*

both men and women, literati, artists, poets, statesmen, and ecclesiastics, we are astonished by his vast connection,\* as well as by the many-sided interests and power of work of this Venetian patrician. The many letters which he composed by command of the Pope relate partly to political and partly to ecclesiastical affairs, as well as to matters of lesser importance and often of quite insignificant account. The elegant stylist knew how to handle each subject, however different, with a classical, and often cold and artistic, elegance. Many of the letters composed by him as Leo's secretary are still unprinted, and many of them have been lost. With the assistance of Cola Bruno, a portion only of these, arranged in sixteen books, was first printed at Venice (1535-1536).† In this edition, dedicated to Paul III., Bembo relates how, when he left Rome, he threw into a chest a pile of rough drafts of letters which he had written in Leo's name during the Pontificate of that Pope; and how his friend Latino Giovenale Manetti had discovered these nearly-forgotten letters and had prevailed on him to publish them. The dedication to Paul III. followed, so that these letters might be held up as a model to other writers of the chancery. In this edition are to be found the letters, the antique expressions and constructions in which have been

Spezi, Roma, 1862; *cf.* NARDUCCI, *Intorno ad alc. lett. ined. del Card. P. Bembo*, Roma, 1862. P. Bembo: *Saggio di 4 Lettere delle 67 inedite a cura di M. Melga*, Napoli, 1861. *Alcune lett. di scrittori ital. del sec., XVI.*, Padova, 1871. *Quattro epistole*, p. p. c. di F. Stefani, Venezia, 1873. *Lett. inedite di P. Bembo a G. B. Ramusio*, Venezia, 1875. CIAN, *Decennio*, gives in his appendix numerous letters of Bembo's, hitherto unknown. See also CIAN, *Motti ined. e sconosciuti di m. P. Bembo*, Venezia, 1888.

\* About Bembo's connection with Isabella d'Este, see *Giorn. d. lett. Ital.*, IX., 81 *seq.*, 117 *seq.*

† *Cf.* CIAN, *Un medaglione del Rinascimento, Cola Bruno e le sue relaz. c. Bembo*, Firenze, 1901.

often quoted as proofs of the paganism which permeated the Papal Court at that time. Such might be the case had these letters been sent out in the form in which they stand printed, but this was not the case. Most of the pagan expressions were inserted later, when the letters were printed; for the greater number of the expressions cited are not to be found in the originals as they were despatched from the chancery of Leo X.\* A servile adherence to the antique would have been out of keeping with the intention of the Medici Pope, who was so large-minded in every respect. Though Leo X. proclaimed his strong desire that "the Latin tongue should flourish during his Pontificate,"† he did not by any means belong to those narrow-minded Latinists who regarded Cicero as the only model of language. "It sufficed him that whatever he had to listen to should be real Latin, flowing and elegant."‡

Bembo took up a prominent position at the Court of Leo X., where everyone was delighted by his intellectual refinement. How indispensable he was to the Pope can be seen by the value which was attached to his mediation. His most intimate friends were Cardinals Bibbiena and Medici, the banker Chigi, and the poets Tebaldeo, Accolti, and Castiglione; while his closest friendship of all was with Raphael. The part taken by him in the intellectual development of the painter of Urbino can scarcely be over-estimated;§ they used to wander about the neighbour-

\* Cf. the proof of this in Appendix, No. 22.

† "Nam inter caeteras curas, quas in hac humanarum rerum curatione divinitus nobis concessa, subimus, non in postremis hanc quoque habendam ducimus, ut latina lingua nostro pontificatu dicatur facta auctior," are the words used in the Brief to Fr. de Rosis, composed by Sadoletto, as found in ROSCOE, VII., 172-173.

‡ BURCKHARDT, *Kultur*, I., 7th ed., 278; cf. REUMONT, *Lorenzo II.*, 2nd ed., 398.

§ JANITSCHKE, *Gesellschaft*, 95.

hood of Rome, revelling in the beauty of antiquity and of nature.\*

At the end of April, 1519, the state of his health, combined with family reasons, compelled Bembo to leave Rome, whither he did not return until the spring of 1520. Again, a year later, on the same plea of health, he asked and obtained leave of absence. In his heart he was determined to finally resign his position in Rome, settle in Padua, and there live in peace and devote himself to study.† Leo X. has been accused of being the cause of Bembo leaving the Eternal City;‡ this is true in so far that nothing short of receiving a Cardinal's hat would have kept him there. That the Pope would not confer this dignity on the elegant man of the world may easily be forgiven him; Bembo, however, thought himself worthy of the purple.§ But still more than disappointed hopes or considerations of health, what weighed with him was the fact that the fatiguing and severe duties of his life at the Papal Court were uncongenial to a man of his literary tastes.|| Moreover, the death of his friends, Raphael, Chigi, and Bibbiena, robbed Rome of its chief attractions; and his many benefices afforded him a sufficient income to devote himself to literature, far away from the turmoil of a court life.

In his work on the poets of the Rome of Leo X., Francesco Arsilli extols Bembo because the pure Tuscan speech which flowed from his pen by no means interfered with his being a master of Latin eloquence. Yet, in spite of his unbounded praise, Arsilli would give him only the second place among the men of letters: the first being

\* See Bembo's letter to Bibbiena, April 3, 1516, in *Opere*, III., 10.

† MAZZUCHELLI, II., 2, 741-742; CIAN, *Decennio*, 5-10.

‡ GNOLI, *Secolo*, II., 635; III., 50.

§ Cf. CIAN, II *seq.*

|| *Ibid.*, 10.



given to Sadoletto.\* It is true that, in more respects than one, this distinguished man holds a position higher than that of his colleague.

He was theologian, philosopher, orator, poet, author, and diplomatist; but it was not only by the versatility of his gifts that he excelled Bembo, but also by the depth and purity of his character. He had always been a model priest, and was a living proof that, where no deterioration of morals is involved, classical studies may become a matter of absorption without injury.

Ever since the publication of his poem on the discovery of the Laocoon group, Sadoletto's renown had been established among the men of letters of Rome; but he took but little part in the brilliant life of the Court of Leo X. As much as he could he led a life of retirement,† and devoted himself above all things to the duties of his office and to profound study. His only recreations of a lighter kind were in the social gatherings of literary friends, at which a meal of classic simplicity was partaken of, followed by the recitation of poems, and by discourses. Many years afterwards, Sadoletto recalled with joy and longing those happy times.‡

\* Besides the older biographies by FIORDIBELLO (in the Roman edition of the *epist.* of 1759, I *seqq.*, and in the Veronese edition of the *Opera Sadoleti*, I., I *seqq.*), and TIRABOSCHI (*Bibl. Mod.*, IV., 424 *seqq.*), see the little-known monograph of A. JOLY, *Sadolet (1477-1547)*, Caen, 1857; *cf.* CANTÙ, *Ital. ill.*, III.; GERINI, *Scritt. pedag. del sec.*, XVI., Torino, 1891; *Miscell. ex Mss. Collegii Romani S. Jesu, Romae*, 1754, 236 *seqq.*; and KOPP in the *Bibliothek der kathol. Pädagogik*, XV., Freiburg, 1904, 339 *seqq.*

† *Cf.* SANUTO, XXVII., 224.

‡ *Sadoleti epist. fam.* I. ep. 106. *Cf.* CIAN in the *Giorn. d. lett. Ital.*, XVII., 298 *seqq.* See also Sadoletto's letter to his friend, Mario da Volterra, appointed Bishop of Aquino by Leo, quoted by CIAN, *Cortegiano*, 215.

The question of ecclesiastical reform occupied the mind of this deeply-religious man. All recognitions of his services, which would have been of the greatest use to him in his position, he invariably refused; in this he gave a rare example of a disinterestedness, most unusual at that time, in never seeking to obtain a benefice for himself. When, in 1517, Leo X., who had already given him many proofs of his favour,\* presented him with the bishopric of Carpentras, Sadoletto wished to refuse it, and only consented to take it by obedience to the clearly-expressed desire of the Pope. Having accepted it, he wished to go at once and reside in his diocese, and there devote himself entirely to study and the duties of his sacred office; however, Leo refused to part with this tried and faithful servant as long as he lived. "Would to God," wrote Sadoletto, "that I could leave Rome and retire to my diocese, and give myself to Christ, my only Lord!"†

Only a small portion of the letters written in the Pope's name by Sadoletto during the term of his office as secretary have been printed.‡ These are written in the classic Ciceronian epistolary style, so highly valued at the time; they are models of form and elegance, full of academic grace, and permeated by that delicate courtesy known only to the Curia.§ In many of the letters he understood how to give expression in a masterly way to the exact thoughts of his master.|| He made use in these of classical figures,

\* Cf. Regest. Leonis X., n. 4775-4777.

† Cf. JOLY, 107 seq., 111-112.

‡ In the Roman edition of the Epist. Sadoleti of 1759, there are in the first volume only ninety-eight of those written in the name of Leo X. Hergenröther publishes many more in his Regesta. There are numerous letters in the Secret Archives of the Vatican, and also in the Archives of Paris and Bologna (Q 5), still unprinted.

§ Cf. JOLY, 59.

|| *Ibid.*, 104 seqq., 118 seqq.

his method in so doing being put into words by himself in his admirable treatise on the education of children. "It is without doubt permissible," he says, "to consider the methods of expression in vogue in those languages which we ourselves want to use. Thus, where there is no question of a specially theological subject, I am willing to introduce and adorn my speech with Latin figures and constructions. Thus I would, for example, speak of Hercules or Zeus (*medius fidiis*) or of the "immortal gods" collectively. Such expressions are not to be taken literally, and serve only to give greater strength and brilliancy to what I am saying, and preserve the idea of antiquity. For when a language is ornamented by the figures of speech belonging to it, it has more weight, and contains greater power to teach right and truth, and inculcate the good which has to be practised." \*

Sadoletto was not the only writer who, though on quite other subjects, knew how to harmonize real Christianity with an ardent love of antiquity.† Of one mind with him were Gianfrancesco Pico della Mirandola,‡ Alberto Pio di Carpi,§ and the young Gian Matteo Giberti, who rejoiced in the favour of both the Pope and Cardinal Medici.||

One of Giberti's friends was the canon-regular, Marco Girolamo Vida (born 1490, died 1566), who had come to Rome in the days of Julius II., and had remained there pure and unspotted, leading the life of a model priest in the midst

\* KOPP, *loc. cit.*, 404-405.

† Cf. GNOLI, *Un giudizio*, 64.

‡ Cf. Vol. VII. of this work, p. 5 *seq.*, and *infra*, p. 406.

§ Cf. *supra*, p. 138.

|| See Tüb. Quartalschr., 1859, 6. It is true that at this time Giberti was not as seriously disposed as he was later; Giorn. d. lett. Ital., XLV., 68. In 1517 Giberti received the freedom of the city of Rome; see GREGOROVIVS, *Schriften*, I., 291. For more about Giberti, see Vol. IX. of this work.

of the general corruption. It does honour to Leo X. that he should have preferred this excellent man in such a marked way that he went generally by the name of the Pope's especial favourite.\* Vida's early poems about chess and silkworms pleased Leo X. so much, that he sent for the author, rewarded him, and bade him set aside all other work and devote his powers to a Christian epic, the subject of which was to be our Divine Saviour's life. That Vida might be able to give himself over undisturbedly to this great task, the Pope—who wished to be another Augustus to another Virgil—gave him the priorate of the monastery of S. Silvestro at Frascati. Few other places in the neighbourhood of Rome could have been better fitted to be the abode of a poet than this cheerful little town, full of classic memories, with its picturesque heights and glorious views. There, in the midst of forests of old olive trees and pines, in view of the magnificent panorama of the Roman Campagna, the "Christiade" of Vida flowed from his pen, though Leo X. did not live to see it completed.† By his inspiration of

\* About Vida, *cf.* LANCETTI, *Vita e scritti di G. Vida*, Milano, 1831; ROSCOE-BOSSI, VII., 134 *seqq.*; BISSOLATI, *Vite di due ill. Cremon.*, Milano, 1856; RONCHINI in the *Atti Mod.*, IV., 73 *seq.*; BERCHIALLA, *G. Vida*, Alba, 1869; GABOTTO, *Cinque lettere di M. G. Vida*, Pinerolo (*Nozze-Publ.*); NOVATI in the *Arch. stor. Lomb.*, 3rd Series, X., 195 *seq.*, XI., 5 *seqq.*; *Giorn. d. lett. Ital.*, XXX., 459 *seq.*, XXXVI., 338 *seqq.*, esp. 343; CICCHITELLI, *Sulle opere poet. di M. G. Vida*, Napoli, 1904.

† The first impression of Vida's "Christiade" appeared at Cremona in 1535, suppressed in 1560. An Italian translation by N. Romana, Napoli, 1894. German translations: (1) Vida's *Jesus Christus, ein lateinisches Heldengedicht*, by J. D. Müller, Hamburg, 1811; (2) *Vida's Christias*, by Hubner, Nissa, 1849. Among Italians the "Christiade" has been recently treated by G. MORONCINI, *Sulla Cristiade di M. G. Vida*, Trani, 1896; ZUMBINI, *Per il giubileo del card. Capecelatro*, Caserta, 1897, 350 *seqq.*; L. GATTA, *G. Vida e la Cristiade*, Palermo, 1900. See also the valuable work of B.



this epic the Pope has rendered a permanent service to Christian poetry. This service is all the greater because, by this act of glorification of Christ, in which Leo was instrumental, "the finest artistic epic of the time of the Renaissance proved the injustice of the accusation made by Luther, that the Papacy had formed itself into a barrier between the Redeemer and the redeemed."\*

Vida's work cannot be appreciated unless we put before ourselves the difficulties connected with his task. In consequence of the inviolable nature of its dogmatic character, it was at the outset impossible to give free scope to his poetic imagination. He had to destroy much which, humanly and poetically speaking, was excellent, because it was theologically inadmissible. It was impossible for the greatest poetical genius to approach the calm grandeur and noble simplicity which meets us at every turn in the chapters of the Bible narrative.† All Christian poets who have ventured to deal with the subject have had to contend with this difficulty, and even Vida was unable to overcome it.‡ But undoubtedly he attained to more than his predecessors. The noble and inexhaustible subject is treated in a manner closely corresponding with the Gospel narrative, "a dignified and majestic, and at the same time an elegant and touching production, expressed in the finest Latin diction."§ The divine nature of Christ shines forth in the poet's explicit dogmatic declaration of the reality of His

COTRONEI in the *Giorn. d. lett. Ital.*, XXXI., 361 *seqq.*; also *Rass. d. lett. Ital.*, 1896, 297 *seqq.*, and *Ateneo Veneto*, XIX. (1896), 2, 134 *seqq.*

\* BAUMGARTNER, IV., 591.

† *Cf.* with BAUMGARTNER, *loc. cit.*, MORONCINI, 64 *seqq.*, and COTRONEI, *loc. cit.*, 366 *seqq.*

‡ COTRONEI, *loc. cit.*, handles these weak points best.

§ "Virgil himself," declares BAUMGARTNER (IV., 591), "could scarcely have done it better."

human nature. The reader will never forget certain passages, as, for instance, that in which Vida describes the flight into Egypt and the life of Jesus at Nazareth.

The Passion is the culminating point of the narrative. Fear, called in by Satan, "the great, black, unconquerable monster, to whom no other fury of the abyss can be compared for hideousness," turns the scale in the mind of the wavering Pilate; the die is cast, and at the words, "King of the Jews," the death of Christ is decided on. With the Risen One the "golden race" of Christians springs into life, and, with a picture of their spread over all the world, the poet closes his work, which is full of many beauties of the first order. By glancing through it we can understand the enthusiasm it evoked in contemporary writers, who in verse and prose hailed Vida as the Christian Virgil.\*

One peculiar merit of the "Christiade" is that the poet rejected all those pagan accessories which in other poems have nearly destroyed the Christian tone. He took Virgil as his model for style and versification, but in essentials the poem remains uninfluenced by the classical element.† Consequently, Vida's poem affords to the reader a more unalloyed pleasure than does the famous epic of Sannazaro, perfect though it is in form, on the Nativity of Christ. In it, and especially in the third book, too much of pagan mythology is employed.‡ Nevertheless, the reality of

\* Cf. esp. ARIOSTO, *Orlando Furioso*, XLVI., 13. No less a poet than Tasso reproduced later on whole pages freely translated from Vida's "Christiade," in his "Gerusalemme Liberata."

† Cf. MORONCINI, 24. See also NORRENBURG, 48 *seq.*, and FLAMINI, 107-108.

‡ Cf. Vol. V. of this work, 141. See also NORRENBURG, 47 *seq.*, and *Stimmen aus Maria-Laach*, X., 234 *seq.* FLAMINI is, however, right when he points out (106 *seqq.*) that some parts of Sannazaro's poem are quite unaffected by any such unsuitable classical references. Cf. NICOLA DI LORENZO, *Sul de partu virginis* di J. S., Pistoia, 1900, 65 *seqq.*

Sannazaro's Christianity cannot be doubted, any more than can be that of the many other poets who allowed themselves the same license. Very much that at first sight looks like paganism is in fact mere poetical license, or at most a concession to the language of the classics.\*

In character Sannazaro† does not stand so high as Vida. This is demonstrated by his relations with Leo X.; he took up the case of the pending marriage of his much-esteemed friend Cassandra Marchese with passionate vehemence.‡ This affair has never been properly explained, because the acts of the process cannot be found;§ it is therefore impossible to say whether the severe accusations which Sannazaro brought against Leo X., on account of his decision in the affair, were well founded or not.||

In a moment of great excitement the poet wrote a mordant epigram in which he ridiculed Leo, and compared him to a blind mole who wanted, against his nature, to be a lion.¶ There is a difference of opinion as to whether these and similar attacks ever came to the ears of the

\* Cf. DANIEL, *Etud.*, 212 *seq.*; BAUMGARTNER, IV., 586, 593; JOLY, Sadolet, 71. See further, MORONCINI, 20, 23-24, and COTRONEI, *loc. cit.*, 362. About Sannazaro's sincere piety, cf. GABOTTO, *La fede di S.*, Bologna, 1891.

† Cf. ROSSI, *Quattrocento*, 364 *seqq.*, where their writings are compared. A special work is expected by Percopo.

‡ See the excellent work of NUNZIANTE, *Un divorzio ai tempi di Leone X.*, Roma, 1887. Cf. SCHERILLO in the *Giorn. d. lett. Ital.*, XI., 131 *seq.*, and NUNZIANTE in the *Arch. stor. Napolitan.*, XII., 699 *seq.*

§ My researches in the Secret Archives of the Vatican have had the same negative result as those made by Nunziantè at an earlier date, when the inventory of those Archives was not accessible.

|| SCHERILLO, *loc. cit.*, like NUNZIANTE, *loc. cit.*, 134, declares that the whole affair is shrouded in darkness.

¶ Epigr., II., 57. Cf. SCHERILLO, *loc. cit.*, 136. The purely personal nature is pointed out with justice by GABOTTO, *loc. cit.*, 31.

Pope.\* As a matter of fact a very flattering Brief was sent on the 6th of August, 1521, to Sannazaro, in which the Pope requested him to publish the poem on the Nativity of Christ without delay. This desire was founded, so ran the Brief, on the hope that the Queen of Heaven might be glorified by the poem, which might act as an antidote to the many writings which were composed with evil intent, "While the Church is being rent and tormented by her enemies, do you exalt her to heaven. Our century will be made famous by the light of thy poem. On one side, standing against her is Goliath, and on the other the frenzied Saul. Let the valiant David come forward and overcome the one with his sling, and calm the other with the sweet sound of his harp."† It has not transpired what answer Sannazaro gave to this request of the Pope; but a distressing proof of the irreconcilable spirit of the poet is to be found in the abusive epigram which he wrote about Leo immediately after the death of that Pontiff. He made an unworthy attack on the memory of the deceased, based on the false report‡ that the Pope had died without the last sacraments.§

The humanists, Girolamo Fracastoro and Battista Spagnolo Mantovano, were more sparing than Sannazaro in their use of the classical elements in literature. The former, who extolled the patronage of Leo X. in extravagant language,|| did not really belong to the

\* See Giorn. d. lett. Ital., XI. 458, n.

† Sannazaro's *Poemata*, XLIII., was first published in the edizione Corniniana without references, and defectively printed in ROSCOE-HENKE, III., 532. In the face of this it does not behove SCHERILLO (*loc. cit.*, 361) to controvert Moroncini's opinion that Leo X. hoped that religion might be promoted by such a poem.

‡ Cf. *supra*, p. 63 *seq.*

§ Epig., III., 8. For a judgment of the epigram, see Giorn. d. lett. Ital., XI., 458, n.

|| Cf. GASPARY-ROSSI, II., 2, 50.



Roman literary world, though united to it by the closest ties. In his poem "Joseph," Fracastoro disdained the use of any pagan phrases. It is to the credit of this humanist, famous alike as physician and philosopher, that he devoted a didactic poem to the curse of the time, the *morbus gallicus*. The elegant and impressive verses on this delicate subject are written with an absence of anything approaching to indecency; certain allusions to ancient mythology being in harmony with its purport. The opening of the second book, which tells of the misfortunes which had overtaken Italy, and indicates the restoration of peace which Rome enjoyed under the rule of the "magnanimous Leo," is very impressive.\*

The Carmelite, Battista Spagnolo Mantovano, elected General of his Order in 1513, who died on March 20th, 1516, and was declared Blessed by Leo XIII., crosses our path like an apparition.† Like Sadoletto he united a deep piety with a great enthusiasm for the treasures of antiquity. He was a most prolific poet, and his fame soon spread throughout Italy, and even beyond it into Germany. His exaggerated admirers gave him the name of a second Virgil.‡ Although he did not entirely discard mythological allusions, even in his sacred hymns, he used them with

\* Cf. ROSCOE-BOSSI, VII., 151 *seq.*; BUDIK, II., 184 *seq.*; CASTELNAU, Médecis, 326 *seq.*; FLAMINI, 106, 112. See also ROSSI, G. Fracastoro in *Relaz. all aristotelismo e alle scienze nel Rinascimento*, Pisa, 1893; BARBARANI, G. Fracastoro, Verona, 1897.

† Cf. F. AMBROSI, *De rebus gestis ac scriptis op. Bapt. Mantuani*, Taurini, 1784; FANUCCHI, *Vita d. b. Batt. Spagnolo*, Lucca, 1887; GABOTTO, *Un poeta beatificato*, Venezia, 1892; *Giorn. d. lett. Ital.*, XX., 469 *seq.*, XXXIV., 59 *seq.*, 67 *seq.*

‡ In Mantua his bust was set up alongside that of Virgil, BETTINELLI, *Lett. ed arte Mantov.* (1774), 100. About other busts and medals, cf. BODE, *Plastik*, 123 *seq.*; *Giorn. d. lett. Ital.*, XX., 469 *seq.*, XXXIV., 66.

great moderation. In several ways he furthered a Christian reaction against the paganism of antiquity, even though he could not rid himself of it altogether. In the beginning of his "Calendar of Feasts" (*De sacris diebus*)\* he tells the reader that he must not expect to find in the pages which follow anything about the false deities. He is not going to treat of Jupiter, Venus, or Juno, but only of those heroes who had attained to heaven, whom the Almighty Father had admitted to the "ethereal city." As the pious Carmelite sings in turn of all the great feasts of the Church, intertwining with them the feasts of the saints, like a beautiful garland of flowers, he brings out the contrast between paganism and the victory gained over it by Christianity. Christ and His saints—such is the burden of his song—have overthrown the false gods; and this keynote runs through the whole poem. The Incarnation of the Son of God is at hand, and the end of the worship of false gods is approaching. Mercury, who, hovering round the Angel Gabriel, has followed him from Mount Carmel, overhears the mysterious greeting of the Angel to the holy Maiden of Nazareth, and at once suspects danger. He hastens back to the gods to tell them what he has heard, and they, full of agitation, take counsel together. They tremble, and Venus and Juno weep; Pallas, full of grief, throws away her spear, but takes it up again, advising that new arts shall be employed to maintain their ancient dominion. In vain! The Redeemer of the world is born, renews all things, laws, sacrifices, and priesthood, and conquers the world. "Give way, O ye gods," sings the poet on the 25th of December; "forsake your temples, for your fame is at an end! Delphic Apollo, shut the door of your false temple; sink with thy tripod into

\* First ed. Lyons, 1516, reprinted by Wimpfeling at Strasburg in 1518.

Hades ; cast thine oracle into the Stygian abyss. Venus, Juno, Jupiter, flee into darkness, for now is your power upon earth at an end. Away, ye tyrants, give up your place and honours, which have been stolen, for behold, the true King enters on his kingdom !"

After such a Christian proclamation it signifies but little that the poet should sometimes make use of ancient classical epithets and call heaven Olympus, God the Father the Thunderer, or hell Hades. That the stars and days should bear pagan names, says the poet, need not trouble us, for they have come to mean good things for us, and can no longer harm us. Battista Spagnolo Mantovano dedicated his "Calendar of Feasts" to Leo X.\* In the poem on the Feast of SS. Cosmas and Damian, and again on that which celebrated all the canonized Popes of the name of Leo, he took the opportunity to offer his homage to his exalted patron.† At the same time he pointed out to him with holy liberty the greatness of the tasks committed to him. He especially named three of these,‡ the restoration of peace to Italy, the protection of the Christian faith against the Turks, and the reform of "the Roman Curia, which was infected by a deep corruption which spread poison throughout all countries." "Help, holy father Leo," exclaimed the poet, "for Christendom is nigh its fall."§

We may rank with Spagnolo's "Calendar of Feasts" the

\* The dedicatory copy, with the arms of Leo X., is kept in the Laurentian Library at Florence, Plut. XIV., Cod. XII.

† Cf. AMBROSI, 92 *seq.* (*op. cit.*).

‡ De sacr. dieb., l. 4 : De sanctis Leonibus.

§ The Pope did not take these strong words of exhortation amiss. On the contrary, he summoned their author to the Council of the Lateran and seconded his efforts to reform the Carmelites (*cf.* AMBROSI, 86 *seq.*). Nevertheless the Pope did not arouse himself to take any stronger measures.



work of Zaccaria Ferreri, written by order of the Pope. This learned though restless man had set himself up under Julius II. as the champion of the schismatic Council of Pisa.\* After Leo's election he resolved to make his peace with the Pope. He offered his submission in the form of a Latin poem, which is a remarkable imitation of Dante's "Divina Commedia."† Although in this poem he demanded a reform of the Church, which was to be led by Rome, and used great freedom of speech,‡ Leo accepted the work very graciously. Ferreri, who was warmly recommended by others, not only received absolution from the censures under which he had fallen by reason of his share in the schism of Pisa, but was singled out in various ways by the indulgent Pope.§ He accompanied Leo on the latter's expedition to Bologna, was made Bishop, and in 1519 was appointed Nuncio in Russia and Poland. There he laboured for the reform of the clergy and the suppression

\* Cf. Vol. VI. of this work, 386.

† Lugdunense Somnium de divi Leonis X. P.M. ad s. apost. apicem divina electione ad r. Franc. Soderinum card. Volat., 1513. There is a copy in the Laurentian Library; see BANDINIUS, Cat. II., 122. Another edition, with dedication to Louis XII., Lugduni, 1513; see MORSOLIN, Un latinista del Cinquecento imitatore del Dante, Venezia, 1894.

‡ Roma tamen purganda prius, postrema moratur,  
Quanto tarda magis, tanto graviora flagella.

§ That the leniency of the Pope towards Ferreri was greater than his court expected, is shown by Paris de Grassis. At Pentecost, 1517, the latter reports: "Sermonem nullus habuit quia cardinalis celebrans [s. Crucis] sic de gratia petiit a papa. Facturus illum erat Zacharias electus titularis qui alias fuit scismaticus et ideo plus placuit omnibus quod non fieret sermo per illum scismaticum et cum papa se remisisset ad vota cardinalium omnes quidem acceptarunt ut non fieret. Hadrianus autem obtulit papae par pavonum si non fieret et papa acceptavit." \*Diarium, Secret Archives of the Vatican, XII., 23.



of the Lutheran heresy.\* How highly Leo X. thought of Ferreri as a poet can be seen by the fact that he turned to him for assistance in his reform of the breviary. It is, however, characteristic that the proposed amendments did not affect the subject but the form of the breviary, the sole object of Leo's efforts being the improvement of the language in which it was written. Ferreri seemed to him the right man to do this, for he had already made a name by the composition of a number of hymns in honour of the saints. Ferreri threw himself with ardour into the work, but Leo died before its completion. It was not until 1525 that a portion of the work, consisting of a revision of the hymns of the breviary, appeared in print.† It is related in the edition of Ferreri's letters to Clement VII. how Leo X., being full of zeal for the Church, and conversant with good literature, and impressed by the deficiencies of the hymns daily used for the praises of God, and seeing how far they were from possessing "true latinity or right metre," gave him the commission "either to improve those in use, or create new hymns devoid of barbarisms." So great was the interest taken by Leo in the work, that he read each hymn as Ferreri completed it. Clement VII.

\* See MORSOLIN, Z. Ferreri, 65 *seqq.*, 70 *seqq.*, and FIJALEK, *Histor. Jahrbuch*, XV., 374. About his appointment as Bishop, see HEFELE-HERGENRÖTHER, VIII., 614. For the faculties received by Ferreri, July 7, 1520, and his mission to the Poles, see *Regest.*, n. 1201, f. 390. Secret Archives of the Vatican.

† Zachariae Ferrerii Vicent. Pont. Gardien. Hymni novi ecclesiastici iuxta veram metri et latinitas normam a beatiss. patre Clemente VII., P. M. ut in divinis quisque eis uti possit approbati et novis Ludovici ac Lantitii Perusini characteribus in lucem traditi, sanctum ac necessarium opus. Breviarium ecclesiasticum ab eodem Zach. Pont. longe brevius et facilius redditum et ab omni errore purgatum propediem exhibit. Romae 1525. (Copies are rare; I am making use of the one in the Bibl. Casanat.)

confirmed the commission to Ferreri to remove everything which contemporary Latinists could find fault with in the rendering of the mediæval hymns. The judgment of posterity is not as favourable as was that of contemporaries. It is undeniable that Ferreri's hymns, belonging as they do to the best time of the Renaissance, contain much that is excellent; nevertheless, in spite of the blamelessness of their classical form, they seem to a sound taste to be weak imitations of the grand, powerful strophes of an earlier time.\* Nothing of the old canticles remains; everything is remodelled and in some parts thought out afresh. If we compare the best of these, *e.g.* the *Veni Creator*,† with the ancient version, we see with amazement how formal the hymn has been rendered, and how even its sense has been lost. Only too often the grand religious dignity suffers under its profane setting. The poetry also of the hymns has suffered. For instance, the wonderful

\* Cf. BÄUMER, 387 *seq.*, and MORSOLIN, Ferreri, 104 *seq.*, in a similar though independent sense. This is shown by Bäumer in connection with the beginning of the hymn to the Holy Trinity:

O celsitudo gloriæ,  
O maximum mysterium :  
Secreta coeli noscere  
Conceditur mortalibus.

† This is how it runs in Ferreri's version, p. xx.:—

Veni beate spiritus  
Nostræque menti illabere,  
Depelle cuncta crimina,  
Et da tuis charismata.

Xenophanis ceu lesbii  
Te iambicis attollimus  
Concentibus : sic effice  
Nos esse coeli compotes.

strength of the hymn *Cælestis urbs Jerusalem* is quite lost.\* Worse still is the clothing of these sacred canticles in classical language, full of pagan pictures and allusions, which are introduced with incredible naïveté. Thus, the Holy Trinity is described as “triforme numen Olympi”; the Mother of God as “fortunate goddess” (*felix dea*), or “most pure nymph (*nympha candidissima*). God is spoken of as the great ruler of the gods (*deorum maximus rector*). The humanist, rejoicing in the beauties of classical constructions, preponderates in Ferreri to a most unsuitable degree.

None of the poets who have been mentioned were Romans. Nevertheless, at Leo's “court of the Muses” native talent was not wanting, the result of the efforts of Nicholas V. to overcome the remarkable mental sterility of Rome in his time.† To the Roman poets belong Marcello Palonio, who sang of the Battle of Ravenna, Egidio Gallo, Battista Casali, Antonio Lelio, Bernardino Capella, Vincenzo Pimpinelli, Lorenzo Vallati, Giambattista Sanga, Lorenzo Grana, Scipione Lancellotti, Camillo Porcari, who

Hyberna pelle frigora  
De cordibus rigentibus ;  
Tuo nitore splendeant,  
Tuo calore ferveant.

Zelum futuri saeculi  
Huiusque vitae taedium  
Des, o perennis halitus  
Parentis atque filii.

\* This re-cast of Ferreri's, p. lxx.b, begins thus :—

Civitas haec est vocitata pacis  
Visio : que de superum beato  
Orbe descendens nova sponsa, gaudet  
Coniuge Christo.

† Cf. Vol. II. of this work, 194 *seq.*

was made professor of elocution by Leo X., and, lastly, Evangelista Fausto Maddaleni de' Capodiferro.\*

This distinguished disciple of Pomponio Leto, to whom Leo X. had given a professorship, had had relations with Julius II., and was one of the most prolific poets of the time, though he was not a happy example. At first he had extolled the Borgia, and finding that this was not remunerative, he changed round and made himself the mouthpiece of all the accusations brought against them by the enemies of their race. Many of his poems betray, by their obscenity, the influence of antiquity. The prolific poet lauded Leo X. in numerous verses, and sang of the different things connected with him, from the elephant presented by the King of Portugal to the artists and works of art of the Rome of the day.†

Several members of the Mellini family, whose name survives in the villa on Monte Mario, and in the tower near S. Agnese, were distinguished as poets. One of them, Celso Mellini, won celebrity both by his dispute with the French humanist Longueil and by his tragic and premature death.

\* For Arsilli's poem, *cf.* RENAZZI, II., 21 *seq.*, and MARINI, Lettera 42 *seq.*, 59 *seq.*, 64, 65, 66. About M. Palonio, A. Lelio, B. Casali, V. Pimpinelli, see ROSSI, Pasquinate, 102, 110 *seq.*, 113 *seq.*, 115. About A. Lelio, *cf.* further, Giorn. d. stor. d. lett. Ital., XXVIII., 59 *seq.*

† His poems are in the Cod. Vat., 3351; *cf.* TOMASINI in the Atti d. Lincei, Ser. IV., Cl. di scienze mor., vol. X., Roma, 1893, and JANITSCHKE in the Repert. für Kunstwissenschaft., III., 52 *seqq.* Other works in the Cod. Vat., 3419; see NOLHAC, 257. For epigrams by him and Blosio Palladio, L. Grana, and V. Pimpinelli on the conferring of civic rights on the Pope's nephews in 1513 (see *supra*, p. 168), see \*Cod. Capponi, 75, f. 91b-112, of the Vatican Library (see also Cod. Barb., LIII., 31). Some of the poems of E. F. M. de' Capodiferro are in Cod. 33 of the Communal Library at Savignano in the Romagna; see MAZZATINTI, Inventari dei Mss. (Forlì, 1890), 1891.



Marcantonio Casanova also was born in Rome, though his family came from Como. This intellectual imitator of Martial dedicated his "Heroica" to the Pope,\* and was in return raised to the rank of count. He was abbreviator apostolic, and had the reputation of being one of the most elegant and ready poets of his day.† The name of "the new Catullus" was given to him, and his epigrams were characterized as "sublime."

The Mantuan, Giovanni Muzzarelli, of whom at first no account was made, drew attention to himself by a laudatory poem on Leo X. The Pope rewarded him by appointing him Governor of Mondaino in the Romagna, where he met with a violent death.‡ Among the court

\* *Heroica Marci Antonii Casanovae* (117 epigrams, a "Hymnus ad virginem Christiparam" and an elegy "de morte patris"). The dedicatory copy to the Pope, a beautiful Renaissance manuscript with the arms of Leo X., was in possession of S. Volpicella, from which an edition was printed in 1867 with a good commentary; this is very rare (*Nozze Medici-Gallone*). The codex, of which I made use in 1893, is now in the Library of the Società di storia patria at Naples. The MS. is of importance, because it shows how uncritical was the publication of the *Carmina ill. poetar. Ital., Parisiis, 1576*. Several poems which, by the evidence of the Naples MS., belong to Casanova, are ascribed to other authors (Tebaldeo, Lampridio, and Molza). Casanova's *Hymnus ad virginem Christiparam* is very characteristic of the way Christianity and Paganism are intermingled. Thus:

Iure Ceres, iure et colitur iam nulla Minerva,  
Nulla soror Phoebi est nec Iovis ulla soror.

Then the poet continues:

In te stelliferi Rector descendit Olympi  
Elegitque uteri candida templa tui  
Quo nascente ruunt veterum simulacra deorum.

The last goes still further:

Pulsa Venus Cypro est: pulsa Diana Epheso.

† Regest. Leonis X., n. 8339 (e e).

‡ Cf. *Giorn. d. lett. Ital.*, XXI., 362; XXVII., 268.

poets was also the Sicilian Jano Vitale, who, in his poem on the election of Leo X., overflowing with repulsive flattery, did not shrink from saying that a new Jupiter had come down from high Olympus who, like Apollo, would heal all sicknesses.\* With the same want of taste a Dominican, Zanobi Acciaiuoli, in other respects a clever man, broke out into a poem, in which, pleading for the adornment of the deserted Quirinal, he compared the Medici Pope with the sun-god Apollo.†

Guido Postumo Silvestri was also highly esteemed as a poet, and sang of the happiness of Italy during the reign of Leo X. In recognition of this the Pope had the poet's ruined possessions restored. Postumo repaid this liberality by an elegy which concludes with these words:—

Pro cytheræ meritis tribuit Leo Maximus aurum,  
Jussit et hinc vatis tecta nitere sui,  
Quippe Amphionii non ficta est fabula muri,  
Si domus hæc blaudæ structa canore lyræ est.

Another poem by the same reached a climax of flattery in a petition to Christ, Mary, and the saints to leave Leo (this *numen*) for a little longer among men, as there were already saints enough in heaven! The same man, in a long poem, celebrated the hunting expeditions of his "divine protector."‡ To-day, Postumo, the friend of Ariosto, and the correspondent of Isabella d'Este, is as

\* ROSCOE-HENKE, II., 412. About Jano Vitale, *cf.* Arch. stor. d. stor. Sicil., N. S., VIII. (1888). See further, Zeitschr. für allg. Gesch., I., 77, and GNOLI, Un giudizio, 162 *seq.*

† ROSCOE-BOSSI, X., 252 *seq.*

‡ *Cf. supra*, p. 161 n. See also BUDIK, I., XLVII. *seqq.*; GEIGER, Renaissance, 302; RENIER, Della corrisp. di G. P. Silvestri in the valuable publication for the *Nozze* Cian-Sappa Flandinet, Bergamo, 1894, 241 *seq.*; Giorn. d. lett. Ital., XXV., 242 *seq.*; and FLAMINI, 117.

much forgotten as is Antonio Tebaldeo of Ferrara, although the latter is remembered by his celebrated tomb in S. Maria in Via Lata.\* Originally intended to be a physician, Tebaldeo later entered the ecclesiastical state. In Rome he soon won the Pope's favour and the friendship of the principal members of the Court. His chief friends were Bibbiena, Bembo and Raphael, who painted his portrait.† Tebaldeo, who may be compared in many ways with Bembo,‡ wrote verses in Latin as well as Italian; among other subjects he sang of Leo's endeavours to promote a crusade;§ he also described in verse Cardinal Medici's villa on Monte Mario. As Tebaldeo was a very skilful improvisatore, he received many tokens of favour from the Pope; a Latin epigram in praise of Leo X. won for him the princely gift of five hundred ducats.||

Besides poets of Italian origin, there were a number of foreigners;¶ for humanists flocked from all parts to the

\* FORCELLA, VIII., 407. Cf. about Tebaldeo, GASPARY, II., I, 306 seq., 307; Giorn. d. lett. Ital., XXXV., 193 seq., XXXVII., 96 seq. ROSSI, Pasquinate, III seq.

† Cf. the interesting letter of Bembo to Bibbiena of April 19, 1516. BEMBO, Opere, III., 11, and CIAN in the Giorn. d. lett. Ital., VIII., 394.

‡ ALTIERI, Nuptiali, 147.

§ Cf. BALBI, Opera, II., 151 seqq.; MICHAUD, VI., 292.

|| Lucae Gaurici Tractatus astrologicus, Venetia, 1552, 65; Giorn. d. lett. Ital., XXXVII., 96; ROSCOE-BOSSI, VII., 11 seq. In Serapica's \*Spese priv. di Leon X., I found the entry on July 13, 1518: A. M. Antonio Tebaldeo duc. 200. State Archives, Rome. On June 12, 1518, Leo sent a \*Letter to Maximilian I.: "pro Antonio Thebaldeo, clerico Ferrarien. famil. nost. super adipiscenda possessione ecclesiae s. Mariae de Bretonico"—Arm., XXXIX., t. 31, 1518, n. 65. Secret Archives of the Vatican. For Tebaldeo, see Giorn. d. lett. Ital., IX., 241 seq., and Supplement, VIII., 113 seq.

¶ Among these especial notice must be taken of the Spaniard Bartolome de Torres Naharro, who, in his comedies, derided the darker side of Papal Rome. Cf. in TICKNOR, I., 240 seq.; II., 172, 697 seq.; and

Eternal City, there to study or make their fortunes. The Germans were, comparatively speaking, numerous ; besides Hutten mention is made of Sustenius, Petrus Aperbachius, Janus Hadelius Saxo, Caius Silvanus, Kaspar Ursinus Velius, and Michael Humelberg. All of these were friends of the hospitable Goritz.\*

The number of poets residing in Medicean Rome is given at more than a hundred by Arsilli and others. The Eternal City was inundated with good and bad poems, odes, letters, epigrams, eclogues ; a pasquinade of 1521 remarks that versifiers in Rome were more numerous than the stars in the heavens.† But the merit of the poems was not in proportion to the number of those who lived under the shadow of the Curia. The oblivion which has been the fate of these Latin versifiers of the time, whose poetry, instead of the divine afflatus, breathed nothing but the atmosphere of the court, is only what they deserved.‡ Nevertheless their importance in the history of the literature of the day must not be denied.§

also GABOTTO, *Un comediografo Spagnuolo alla corte di Leone X.* in the *Gazz. lett. di Torino*, 1889, No. 17. See also FLAMINI, 559. About the Spaniard Saturno Gerona (ob. 1523), whose poetical epitaph is in *S. Maria dell' Anima*, see the clever treatise of GNOLI in *Nuova Antologia*, 3rd Series, LI., 232-248.

\* GREGOROVIVS, VIII., 328. *Cf.* *Ges. Schriften*, I., 299 *seq.* and GEIGER in the *Vierteljahrschr. f. Lit. der Renaiss.*, I., 148, 523. See also BAUTZ, *Kasp. Urs. Velius*, Buda-pest, 1886. *Cf.* F. GÜLDNER, *Jakob Questenberg, ein deutscher Humanist in Rom.*, Bonn, 1906.

† *Carmina apposita Pasquillo anno, 1521.* *Cf.* GNOLI, *Pasquino*, 23. About the "smania versaiola" of that time, see also CIAN in the *Giorn. d. lett. Ital.*, XVII., 277.

‡ *Cf.* REUMONT, III., 2, 350 *seq.* ; JOLY, *Sadolet*, 29 ; and GEIGER in the *Zeitschr. f. Renaissancelit.*, I., 158 *seq.* ; CIAN in the *Giorn. d. lett. Ital.*, XXIX., 439.

§ *Cf.* FLAMINI, 125.



The new-fashioned enthusiasm for Latin poetry in Rome had a strong influence on contemporary Italian poetry. Prolific as were the results in this field of literature, there was a singular lack of originality. Even the two best of the lyric poets, Bembo and Molza, in spite of their high gifts, produced nothing better than elegant imitations. In their footsteps there followed an army of imitators, who obtained among Italians the appropriate name of "rimatori."\* Francesco Maria Molza, who went by the name of the modern Tibullus, was in reality a highly-gifted poet, but unfortunately wasted his talents in an unsettled and dissolute life.† The names of the remainder of the Italian poets survive only in literary records, and it is with astonishment that we see the praise which was lavished on them at the time that they wrote. Who, for instance, knows to-day anything about the poet Bernardo Accolti, "the great light of Arezzo"? "The only one" (l'unico) is how he styled himself, and how he was styled by others. Accolti sang the praises of the generous Leo, who had rewarded him so lavishly that he was able to buy the title of Duke of Nepi. The fame of this native of Arezzo is to-day quite inconceivable; but he enchanted the society of his time by his gay, witty prattle, which was joined to the art, then highly valued, of accompanying his verses with suitable music. Pietro

\* Beside REUMONT, III., 2, 326 *seq.*, *cf.* TIRABOSCHI, VII., 3, 3. Contemporaries jeered at many of these rhymesters, as, *e.g.*, G. Casio; *cf.* ROSSI, Pasquinate, 81; Giorn. storia d. lett. Ital., XXXVIII., 56 *seq.*, and GEREMIA, G. Casio, Palermo, 1902. About another of these mediocre versifiers, Mariangelo Accursio, see CALI in Nuova Rassegna, I., 45 *seq.*, and Bull. stor. abruzz., V., VI. About the Canzoni of Gugl. de' Nobili, written in honour of Leo X., see (PAWLOWSKI) Cat. des livres de la bibl. Firmin-Didot, 1878, 36.

† See ROSCOE-BOSSI, VII., 33 *seq.*; BUDIK, II., 40 *seq.* *Cf.* GASPARY-ROSSI, II., 2, 290, and FLAMINI, 550 *seq.*

Aretino,\* who had just come to Rome, being subsidized by the Pope, and high in the favour of Cardinal Medici, relates that "when the heavenly Accolti was about to improvise on the lute, the shops were shut and prelates and other personages flocked to listen to him." Pietro Aretino was himself sent one day by the Pope, to remind Accolti of a visit which he had promised to pay His Holiness. When Accolti entered the Vatican, Leo X. commanded that every person should give way before him. The poem which he sang about the Blessed Virgin filled his hearers with such admiration that, when he had finished, one and all cried out: "Long live the divine poet!" This production is preserved, and when we read it we can but wonder at the applause which it called forth;† undeniably the standard of excellence in those days was very different from what it is now.

The poet Agostino Beazzano was provided with rich benefices; he expressed his thanks to the Pope in Italian sonnets and Latin epistles.‡ The poet Giangiorgio Trissino§ stood still higher in the favour of Leo X., and was sent by him on diplomatic missions. This prominent citizen of Vicenza, having come to Rome in 1514, armed with warm recommendations from Isabella d'Este and Cardinals Bibbiena and Luigi d'Aragona, was received most honourably by the Pope. In the autumn of the

\* He received 50 ducats in August 1520. See Cesareo, 199.

† Cf. ROSCOE-BOSSI, VII., 15 *seq.*; GASPARY, II., I, 311; ROSSI, Pasquinate, 112 *seq.*; CIAN, Cortegiano, XVII.; GNOLI, Cacce. 40 *seqq.*; Giorn. de. lett. Ital., XXXIX., 228 *seqq.*; and E. GUARNERA, B. Accolti, Palermo, 1901, 101 *seqq.* About Leo's tokens of favour to B. Accolti, see Regest. Leonis X., n. 3164, 12,019.

‡ ROSCOE-BOSSI, VII., 30 *seq.* Cf. MAZZUCHELLI, II., 2, 571 *seq.*

§ MORSOLIN, Giangiorgio Trissino, Firenze, 1894. Cf. Giorn. d. lett. Ital., XXIII., 435 *seq.* Morsolin published the Lettere del card. Giulio de' Medici al Trissino at Vicenza (*Nozze-Publ.*), 1881.

following year Trissino was charged with a difficult mission in Germany to the Emperor Maximilian, which kept him on the other side of the Alps until the spring of 1516; in the autumn of the same year there followed a mission to Venice; the distinguished nobleman refused to receive any remuneration for his services.\* As early as 1515 he had dedicated to the Pope his tragedy "Sofonisba,"† not without misgivings that the classical-minded Medici would take amiss that the work should be written in Italian. The subject of the poem, written in blank verse (*versi sciolti*), is borrowed from the thirteenth book of Livy;‡ the tragedy is cold and lifeless, and as for Trissino's heroic epic, "Italy liberated by the gods," which appeared in 1547, it can only be condemned as an utter failure.§

Trissino's friend, Giovanni Rucellai, also wrote in blank verse with no better results.|| Being a near relative of the Pope's, the latter often entrusted him with political business, and sent him, for instance, on a mission to Francis I. at a critical moment (in September 1520).¶ It is asserted by

\* Cf. MORSOLIN, 80 *seq.*, 91-95. See also *Giorn. d. lett. Ital.*, XXXVII., 233 *seq.*

† Cf. MORSOLIN, 69 *seq.*; FLAMINI, 242; and D'ANCONA, *Varietà*, II., Milano, 1885, 261 *seq.*

‡ The statement that it was produced in Rome is incorrect (MORSOLIN, 75 *seq.*).

§ Cf. MORSOLIN, 282 *seq.*, 312 *seq.* See also REUMONT, III., 2, 348 *seq.*; ERMINI, *L'Italia liberata* di G. Trissino, Roma, 1893; and also MORSOLIN in *Rassegna bibliogr.*, 1895, No. 1. The violent verses against the Roman abuses are lacking in some copies of the original, which, according to MORSOLIN (*Un poeta ipocrita*, in *Nuova Antologia*, I, Nov. 1882), were intended for the Pope and the Curia.

|| MAZZONI, *Opere* di G. Rucellai, Bologna, 1887, *Prefaz.*; *Giorn. d. lett. Ital.*, XI., 458 *seq.*; MORSOLIN, Trissino, 69. Cf. *Propugnatore*, N. S., III., I, 374 *seq.*

¶ Cf. *supra*, p. 14.

many that Rucellai's tragedy "Rosmunda" was put on the stage on the occasion of Leo's sojourn in Florence; but there is nothing certain about this.\* Among the poets of that time there appears the name of another relative of the Pope's, Pietro de' Pazzi; how far the praises lavished on him by contemporaries were justified must remain a matter of doubt.†

It is remarkable that the Medici Pope who patronized so many poetasters and vagrant poets‡ should have been on very distant terms with Ariosto. Confident of a friendly reception by the Pope, the poet had hastened to Rome after the election of Leo X.; when the courteous reception with which he met raised the poet's expectations. All the greater was his astonishment when this led to nothing. The clever satires in which Ariosto pictured the affairs of Rome prove the greatness and depth of his disillusionment. Still, all through his disappointment, and in all his most bitter attacks, one can see his intention of screening the Pope personally, having received from him a privilege against piracy for his "Orlando," and many other tokens of favour.§

\* MAZZONI, *loc. cit.*, xviii.; GASPARY, II., 2, 298.

† Cf. GNOLI, *Un giudizio*, 41.

‡ See BERNARDO GIAMBULLARI, *Soneti rustici* di Biagio del Capperone, pubbl. a cura di C. Arlia, Città di Castello, 1902; see *Giorn. d. lett. Ital.*, XLI., 170 *seq.*

§ Cf. SADOLETI, *epist.*, 193; BEMBI, *epist.*, X., 40; ROSCOE-BOSSI, VII., 41 *seqq.*; ROSSI, *L'Ariosto e il beneficio di S. Agata* in *Rendiconti dell' Ist. Lomb. d. scienze e lett.*, 2nd Series, XXXI. (1898), 1169 *seqq.*; *Giorn. d. lett. Ital.*, XXXVII., 249; A. VALERI in *Rev. d'Italia*, 1900, I., 517 *seqq.* REUMONT, III., 2, 347, declares that the privilege about the publication of the "Orlando" has foolishly been made use of to bring accusations against Leo X., just as if it contained a Papal approbation of Ariosto's poems, whereas its only object was the usual protection against piracy. This is just; but, on the other hand, CASTELNAU (Les



Next to poetry, rhetoric occupied the most prominent place in the Rome of Leo X. As a child of the Renaissance, as well as belonging to a people devoted to things pleasant to the ear, the Pope enjoyed good Latin prose as keenly as the most melodious verse;\* the replies to the solemn speeches of Ambassadors sent to make their "obedientia," which had been occasions of confusion to Julius II., who had not his classical culture, were a real delight to his successor; he understood how to reply with an astounding readiness and elegance.† This skill contributed not a little to the renown of the Medici Pope at a time when such exaggerated value was placed on classical elegance, as to cause a good rhetorician to be put on a level with a great painter.‡

The speeches which were most admired in those days fail to stir us if we read them now. There is much classical learning in them but very little originality; even in the best, the happiest thoughts and the noblest conceptions are submerged by a flood of high-flown phrases. In vain do we look for true imagination or deep thought in these declamations; the elegance of the form drives out everything else;§ the purport of the discourses is often horrible, and the want of truthfulness is indescribable! As in the

Médicis, II., 336), is justified when he says: "Vue de plus haut, cette manifestation de puissance spirituelle en faveur d'une œuvre profane, adverse au fond, sinon hostile, à l'esprit chrétien, met en plein jour le caractère de l'évolution accomplie au faîte de l'Eglise. About the "Orlando," *cf.* Vol. V. of this work, 121 *seq.* About Leo X. and Ariosto, *cf.* CIAN, *loc. cit.*, 423.

\* BURCKHARDT, *Kultur*, I., 3rd ed., 275.

† *Cf.* Vol. VII. of this work, 70, 73, 136, and *supra*, 78.

‡ *Cf.* BURCKHARDT, I., 3rd ed., 350, who cites Petrus Alcyonius, *de exilio* (ed Mencken, 136).

§ *Cf.* JOLY, Sadolet, 53, and CIAN in the *Giorn. d. lett. Ital.*, XIX., 152.

classical letters of the time, so also in the discourses, infinite praise is dispensed for which there is not a shadow of justification. When facts failed, a supposed intention is lauded, and brilliant phrases are strung together which bear a semblance to praise.\* This power of disingenuous flattery seemed to be innate in the orator of the day. Often, for instance, a funeral oration might be very much admired and extolled as a work of art, although the man eulogized might not possess any one of the qualities falsely attributed to him.† If only fine-sounding phrases, well delivered and sonorous, were poured into their ears, the hearers were quite satisfied. In this respect Leo X. was no exception; the exaggerated value he set on fine discourses is shown by his decree issued in 1514, that every meeting of the Conservatori should be opened with a speech by a born Roman about distinguished Roman citizens of past ages.‡ The feast of the patronal saints of the Medici, SS. Cosmas and Damian, was celebrated by orations; on one of these occasions Raffaello Brandolini, so renowned as an improvisatore and letter-writer, made an oration and afterwards glorified his exalted patron in an elegant dialogue entitled "Leo."§

\* Cf. JOLY, 57.

† In this light the following account given in Paris de Grassis of the obsequies of Card. Sisto Gara della Rovere, on the 3rd of April, 1517, is very interesting: \*Camillus Portius canonicus Romanus elegantissimam habuit orationem cum admiratione omnium expectantium quo evasurus esset orator ipse in laudem unius viri qualis iste fuit nullius ingenii, nullius veritatis, virtutis sed abiectissimi viri sicut unus asinus et tamen elegantia et dexteritas oratoris tanta fuit ut in laudem ipsius viri evaserit. Paris de Grassis, \*Diarium. Secret Archives of the Vatican, XII., 23.

‡ Cf. *infra*, p. 239, n.

§ About Raffaello Brandolini Lippi, cf. TIRABOSCHI, VI., 2, 270; AMATI, 235; BROM in the Röm. Quartalschr., II., 175 *seq.*, and esp.

The Turkish peril was also the occasion of numerous orations.\*

Besides these orations the very inferior sermons in the Papal chapel must not be overlooked; these very often could not be distinguished from ordinary speeches. Leo X. desired that they should be short, not exceeding a quarter of an hour in length;† not seldom the Pope sent for a preacher who had made good his case and expressed his approval.‡ Giovio says that a sermon well preached might lead to a bishopric.§ In 1513, Leo X. had the censorship of the court preachers by the Master of the Sacred Palace made more severe,|| but even then it was far from being

FOGLIAZZI in the preface to Raph. Brandolini Lippi iun. *Dialogus Leo nuncupatus*, Venetiis, 1753. The original dedicatory copy, sumptuously ornamented, of his *Oratio de laudibus eloquentiae in aede divi Eustachii ad populum habita* XV. Cal. Nov., 1513, is kept in the Classense Library, Ravenna.

\* Cf. Vol. VII. of this work, 233, about Sadoletto. See also *infra*, pp. 385, 387, about the speeches at the Council. A speech by A. Navagero on the Turkish question is mentioned by GEIGER, *Renaissance*, 274. Baltasar de Rio Pallantinus, *Oratio de expedit. contra Turchos inuenda*, Romae (Mazochius), 1513, is exceedingly rare, and wanting in Graesse.

† Cf. Paris de Grassis in CREIGHTON, V., 315.

‡ This is reported by Leo's Master of Ceremonies as having taken place on S. Stephen's feast 1516: \**Sermonem habuit quidam frater s. Dominici de Placentia de domo Alemanorum et doctissimum et elegantissimum ita ut papa post missam miserit pro ipso fratre et multum eum commendaverit de doctrina et elegantia et arte concionandi*. Paris de Grassis, \**Diarium Secret Archives of the Vatican*, XII., 23.

§ P. Iovii *Dialogus de viris lit. illustr.* in BURCKHARDT, I., 3rd ed., 283.

|| This report, which is only partially given in MÜNTZ, *Raphaël*, 426, and BURCKHARDT, II., 7th ed., 351, and not quite correctly in CREIGHTON, V., 315, appears in a copy of Paris de Grassis in the Secret Archives of the Vatican, XII., 23: "*Sermonem habuit quidam*

strict. The abuse, existing in the time of Julius II., and animadverted on by Erasmus, of the Ciceronian phrases with which preachers treated more of antiquity than of Christianity, continued under Leo X.\* A quite irreproachable witness, the Master of Ceremonies, Paris de Grassis, relates the scandal given by a humanist preacher who, on the Feast of St. John the Baptist in 1517, appealed, in the presence of the Pope, to the gods and goddesses "in a manner more pagan than Christian."† These preachers saw no more evil in this than did the humanist Mario Equicola, who, in his discourse at a beatification by Leo X., quoted Castor, Romulus, and others, who had been raised to be gods.‡ Pierio Valeriano went still further in his funeral oration on Cardinal Bibbiena, delivered in the presence of Leo X. He thus appealed to the Cardinal's shade: "We ask not to what part of Olympus thine immortal virtue has led thee in thy golden chariot; but when thou passest through the heavenly spheres, and when thou beholdest the heroes there, then forget not to pray the King of heaven and the other gods that, if they wish to enjoy the worship of others upon earth, they may add to Leo's life the years

*scholaris Narniensis satis scholastice et potius gentilitio more quam christiano, invocans deos deasque in exclamazione sua ita ut multi riserint multi detestati fuerint. Ego increpavi magistrum palatii qui non corrigit quando praevidet eos sermones. Papa patienter tolleravit ut est sui moris patientissimi et dulcissimi.*" About another humanist discourse, see LÜTOLF, *Schweizergarde*, 20 *seq.*

\* Ciceronianus, 219 *seq.* Cf. SCHUCK, *Aldus*, 98, and GNOLI, *Un giudizio*, 16 *seq.*

† Paris de Grassis in DELICATI-ARMELLINI, 13. Cf. KALKOFF, *Forschungen*, 174.

‡ Oratio ad Isab. Est. in consecratione divae Andreasiae. Cf. LUZIO-RENIER, *Giorn. d. lett. Ital.*, XXXIV., 18; here are also further details about Equicola, who came to Rome in the suite of Gonzaga in 1513.



of which the impious Fates have deprived thee and Giuliano de' Medici."\*

Many of the discourses of that time were not delivered in the form in which we now possess them in manuscripts and printed editions. This applies equally to the great oration alleged to have been delivered at the Capitol, on the 21st of April, 1521, on the festival of the "Palilia," by the "Riformatore" of the University,† when, in accordance with a resolution of the Senate, of the year 1518, a colossal marble statue of Leo X.‡ was erected. The orator§ makes a survey of nearly the whole history of Rome; he even begins by the first records of the history of mankind. Being a Roman born, he dwells with preference on the ancient history of his own city. He impressively draws the contrast between what it was in former days and what it was at the time in which he was speaking. "The seven hills, covered of yore with houses, are covered to-day with ruins and vineyards. Of the sixteen forums with their basilicas and temples we see now only open spaces. Of the twenty aqueducts there now remains only the Aqua Virgo. Of the thirteen baths

\* P. VALERIANI, *Hexametri*, Ferrariae, 1550, 78; GREGOROVIVS, VIII., 273.

† *Oratio totam fere Romanam historiam complectens habita Romae in aedibus Capitolinis XI. Kal. Maii*, 1521, ab anonimo auctore die qua dedicata fuit marmorea Leonis X., P.M. statua, ed. R. Venuti, Romae, 1735. That Leo heard this speech is an arbitrary assumption on the part of GREGOROVIVS, VIII., 297. The speech was never delivered; see GNOLI, *Un giudizio*, 35. Gregorovius could have seen this, as it fills 134 sheets of print.

‡ Cf. RODOCANACHI, *Capitole*, 110 *seq.*, and *infra*, p. 352.

§ Venuti thinks that this was Celso Mellini; but he had died in 1520. MARINI (*Lettera*, 39) thinks it was G. B. Veralli. But GNOLI (*Un giudizio*, 36) makes it seem probable that it was Blosio Palladio. See all the allusions to the subject in Longueil.

all that is left to us are the ruins of those of Diocletian and Caracalla. Of the three hundred temples the sole one remaining perfect is the Pantheon. Of Vespasian's amphitheatre, once counted among the wonders of the world, we can find only a crumbling fragment. Where are the five Naumachia, the eleven Nymphæa, the four Circuses, the six great obelisks, the twenty-four libraries, the ten basilicas, the twenty-two bronze horses, the thirty-six triumphal arches, and all the many other edifices? They all lie in ruins, shattered or burned for lime, and destroyed in such a manner that no trace of them remains."

The pain of the orator at this unparalleled destruction grows upon him the longer he dwells on the wonders of ancient Rome. He looks so exclusively at the bright side of antiquity that he rejects as unfounded the accusation that the Romans of old could have carried on unjust wars or oppressed provinces. In the darkest possible colours he paints the "barbarians from Gaul and Germania" who overwhelmed the Roman Empire. In the second part of his writing—for such must his oration be styled—the author dwells on the fame of modern Christian Rome. "Having conquered lands and seas by our arms and won immortal renown by our literature, there only remained for us to win a share in heaven by religion. Thus, even as Numa succeeded Romulus, did religion succeed to the glories of war." Then he enters on enthusiastic praise of the Popes, "who not only represented in part the ancient empire on earth, but founded a new and spiritual empire." No city in the world had promoted Christianity as mightily as had Rome. "This is proved by the number of Popes who have sprung from Rome, by the thousands of martyrs whose relics we venerate to this day on the Latin, Appian, and Ostian ways. If, therefore, the Roman Empire perished as a human work, we must rejoice because its

ruin was the beginning of something new and better. Thus are we born in happier times ; for we do not honour the cruel Mars, the adulterous Jupiter, the corrupt Venus, the deceitful Mercury, but the triune God." All this and much more, he goes on, Rome has owed to the Popes ; but none of them has been so popular as Leo X., whose marble statue was about to be set up. He described with enthusiasm the services of Leo to the city, and extolled his life and good qualities. The Pope had given edifices to the city and saints to heaven ; he had built churches, reformed morals, and restored peace to Rome, and proved himself the father of his country. In conclusion, the orator declared that not to Jupiter would he pray for a long life for the Pope, but to the Capitoline Virgin, the Mother of God.

Even as in this panegyric, so also in a similar work by Matteo Ercolano, the Christian element is given more importance than we should have expected, considering the pagan current which ran through the literature of the time. Ercolano, who, as an old friend of the Medici, experienced the favour of Leo in many ways, confined himself to relating the life of his exalted protector. He gives many interesting particulars in his biography of Leo X., but unfortunately his work reaches only to the fourth year of his pontificate.\*

As masters of Ciceronian oratory the first place must be given to Tommaso Inghirami and Camillo Porzio, made Bishop of Teramo by Leo X. These "lights of the Roman Academy," exalted as such by Giovio, had as rivals for the laurels of eloquence Battista Casali, Lorenzo Grana, Blosio Palladio, Sadoletto, Egidio Canisio, Vincenzo Pimpinelli,

\* The work *\*Mathaei Herculani Encomion in Leonem X.*, P. M., which is often made use of, especially by Fabronius, is in the Laurentian Library at Florence, Plut. LI., Cod. XVI.; cf. BANDINIUS, II., 538.

and many other humanists, not a few of whom had the honour of showing their skill before the Pope.\*

A learned Frenchman† came to Rome in 1516 who proved to be a formidable rival of Porzio and Casali. Christophe Longueil (latinized into Longolius) attracted to himself many friends, among whom were Bembo and Sadoletto.‡ Those, however, who were hostile to and jealous of the foreigner did not fail to show their venom, and turned on him on account of a speech he had delivered years before (1508) in Poitiers, in which he had maintained the superiority of France over Rome and all Italy. Longueil tried to make amends for this, and at the end of 1518, in Giberti's house, made five speeches in praise of Rome.§ His friends contrived to obtain for him the freedom of the city, but his enemies on their side managed to delay the drawing up of the necessary diploma. When Longueil, after waiting for some time, asked on the 9th of April, 1519, for the fulfilment of the promise, the Conservatori declared that what he had said earlier in depreciation of Rome must first be gone into.||

Two literary parties bitterly opposed to one another now sprang up: on the one side being the friends of the learned Frenchman, and on the other Roman patriots full of national sentiment, under the leadership of the young

\* Cf. GNOLI, *Un giudizio*, 12-16; CIAN, *Cortegiano*, 204, 210; and GOTHEIN, *Kulturentwicklung*, 454 *seq.* The discourse delivered by C. Porzio before Leo X., about the King of Portugal, was the occasion of a laudatory epigram. See VOLTICELLA, *Heroica M. A. Casanovae*, Napoli, 1867, 19 and 40. Blosio's speech on Leo X. is printed in *Anecd. lit.*, II.

† Cf. CIAN, XIX., 373 *seq.*

‡ Cf. SABBADINI, *Storia del Ciceronianismo*, 53 *seqq.*

§ This is to be found in \*Cod. Ottob., 1517, pp. 44-185 of the Vatican Library. Cf. GNOLI, *Un giudizio*, 20 *seq.*

|| GNOLI, *loc. cit.*, 24-28.



Celso Mellini, who was supported by many others.\* Jealousy of the ambitious, self-conceited foreigner was all-powerful, and to this there was added an extreme susceptibility as to the greatness of Rome, and the fear of the growth of a foreign humanism which seemed to threaten the literary primacy of Italy. It was maintained quite seriously that Longueil, who was known for his diligence in copying manuscripts, was secretly employed by Erasmus and Budæus to rob the libraries of Rome of their literary treasures.

From the humanists the feeling soon spread to the people, who turned with fanaticism against the French and indeed against all foreigners, whom they styled barbarians. To take a part against Longueil appeared to many in the light of a patriotic duty; a morbid and exaggerated idea of nationality united itself naturally with a biassed Renaissance.† Although the literary aristocracy, represented by Bembo and Sadoleto, placed itself on the side of the foreigner, his adversaries were in an immense numerical superiority, and the waves of excitement rose higher and higher. Even if the dark description of Longueil be exaggerated, it nevertheless speaks for itself that the German colony felt itself in danger, and through the "Anima" repudiated all connection with Longueil.‡

It is highly significant that such an affair should have stirred up an excitement so great, that it has with reason been asserted that the Longueil affair caused more disquietude in Rome in 1519 than did the movement of

\* Chief among these was Tommaso Pighinucci di Pietrasanta, the tutor of the sons of Mario Mellini. With GNOLI, 31 *seq.*, 38, *cf.* CIAN, *Giorn. stor. d. lett. Ital.*, XIX., 154.

† *Cf.* Vol. I. of this work, 87.

‡ This statement of Mellini (GNOLI, 41) is worthy of belief, although there is no corresponding document in the Archives of the Anima.

Martin Luther.\* The Pope took the side of him who was attacked, and, manifestly under the influence of Bembo and Sadoleto, showed to Longueil, on the 12th of April, 1519, the most unusual tokens of favour.†

On the other side, a formal deed of accusation was drawn up by the opponents of Longueil, by which he was solemnly cited to appear before the senate and people of Rome on the charge of high treason (*crimen laesae maiestatis*) because of his utterances against Rome and Italy. With "boisterous fervour" a court of justice was assembled, and proceedings were instituted against him on the model of those of ancient Rome, which shows more than could anything else the fantastic dreamland in which many of the humanists lived.‡

Never before had the halls of the Capitol witnessed such a large assembly of learned and literary men as on the day when the trial of Longueil was opened. It is rightly ascribed to the influence of Bembo and Sadoleto that the proposal to take back the freedom of the city given to Longueil was negatived. Nothing, however, could prevent the proposed charge being brought against him, and it was decided that the matter should be discussed by both sides, and public sentence be passed in accordance with the result.§ Thus in yet another form was Rome to live antiquity over again.

Great were the preparations, and greater still was the state of general expectation. Many Cardinals and prelates, and even the Pope, went to the Capitol on the day fixed,

\* Cf. REUMONT, III., 2, 351, and GNOLI, 40.

† In the first Brief of April 19, 1519, made known by CIAN (*Giorn, d. lett. Ital.*, 378 *seq.*), Longueil was legitimized; in the second he was named Count of the Sacred Palace and Notary Apostolic.

‡ Cf. GREGOROVIVS, VIII., 331; see also Kl. Schriften, I., 292 *seqq.*

§ GNOLI, 45-46.

anxious to enjoy the spectacle of a great literary contest. But disappointment awaited them; for Longueil had deemed it prudent to withdraw by secret flight (in the middle of June, 1519) from the wrath of his enemies.\*

The clever speech of the young Mellini,† which stirred up the national passions of the Romans, left nothing to be desired in the way of violence. In all seriousness he demanded that, in accordance with the ancient Roman law, his adversary should be put to death, or at least cast into prison as a traitor. Contemporaries testify to the excitement which prevailed,‡ and Baldassare Castiglione is sure that, had Longueil been present, he would have been either thrown from the window, or torn in pieces.§ Mellini's eloquence made an impression on Longueil's friends, and he won by his speech the commendation of Leo X., who was, however, by no means induced to give up his support of Longueil. The Frenchman's defence, which his friends had printed in Rome in August, worked in his favour.|| In it he treats his cause with great skill; he throws himself into the fiction of an ancient trial, speaks as a republican of old Rome who, finding himself accused before the senate and people, defends himself and endeavours to show that he is not guilty according to the provisions of the *Lex Julia*. He not only eloquently

\* GNOLI, 47-49.

† The speech of Mellini, which was believed to be lost, is in the Vatican Library, \*Cod. Vatic, 3370, and has since been printed by GNOLI, 99-118.

‡ Cf. especially the letter published by CIAN in the *Giorn. d. lett. Ital.*, XIX., 155-156, from A. Gabbioneta to M. Equicola, June 30, 1519.

§ Letter of June 16, 1519, in GNOLI, 54.

|| This first version of *Christ. Longolii civis Ro. perduellionis rei defensio*, which has hitherto remained unknown, was discovered in the Angelica Library and published by GNOLI (pp. 121-160), who deserves much credit for the light he has thrown on the whole affair.

recalls the greatness of ancient Rome, but points to the spiritual supremacy of the Eternal City as the centre of the Church. "It is true," he says, "that of yore your fathers ruled over a great portion of the world, and although to-day you no longer send forth your prætors and proconsuls, you despatch all over the world your bishops and archbishops—Spaniards, Frenchmen, Germans, Hungarians, and Englishmen—in short, all men, for all who confess the true religion of Jesus Christ belong to Rome."

An unexpected turn in favour of Longueil was caused by the untimely death of his adversary, Celso Mellini. In November, 1519, he was taking part in one of the Pope's hunting expeditions near Magliana, and on that occasion received a special mark of the favour of the Pope. Overjoyed and anxious to convey the good news to his relatives, he hastened back to Rome; and in the darkness of the night fell into a swollen stream and was drowned. The death of the talented young man caused general sorrow, and many poems were written to his memory. The Pope caused a bridge to be set up on the unlucky spot with a Latin inscription, still preserved, remarkable for its elegant simplicity.\*

Meanwhile, Longueil had removed from Paris to Louvain; when there, he visited Erasmus, and the trial conducted so seriously in Rome struck this eminent critic as most strange. In spite of his bitter experience, Longueil could

\* GNOLI, after he had finished his work, found this poem in the Alessandrina Library (I K 43): In Celsi Archelai Melini funere amicorum lacrimae. Impressit Romae Ia. Mazochius, and printed it at once in an appendix, p. 165. Cf. 73 *seq.* about Mellini's death. See also LUZIO-RENIER, Mantova, n. 233. The "giambi insignificanti" (GASPARY-ROSSI, II., 2, 283), which Leo X. had composed as a Cardinal and had engraved on a statue of Lucrezia found in the Trastevere, are printed in ROSCOE-BOSSI, XI., 230-231.



no longer resist his longing to be once more in beautiful Italy; and by the help of Bembo found a quiet refuge, first in Venice, and then in Padua, where he lived on a pension given to him by Leo X., and devoted himself entirely to study. In February, 1520, he had proudly refused a professorship in Florence offered to him by Cardinal Medici through Sadoletto.\* In May, 1520, however, he had the satisfaction of receiving the diploma of the freedom of the city of Rome. It was through Bembo that a request was sent to Longueil from the Pope to write against Luther; he did this in the form of five discourses. Bembo and Navagero were full of praises of the work, declaring that Longueil alone had made his way into the Lutheran citadel, by popularizing the theology of the schools. The adverse judgment of Erasmus is more appropriate. In spite of his admiration of the skill with which the learned Frenchman clothed theological ideas in Ciceronian garb, he declared that the freedom of his movements was hampered by the strangeness of the clothing.†

Longueil enjoyed his triumph for a short time only, for, worn out by the strain of work, he died in September, 1522. In a second edition of his "Apology," which became in his hands a model of Ciceronian style, he had set himself against the festival of Pasquino, on which occasion, he said, virtuous people were attacked by anonymous poems.‡ The passage is of importance because it prevented the composition of any satirical pasquinade for a whole year.§ This change was being slowly introduced during the time of Leo X., with the consequence that Pasquino became

\* SABBADINI, 56; GNOLI, 62-68.

† Cf. GNOLI, 88.

‡ *Ibid.*, 83.

§ Cf. LUZIO in the *Giorn. d. lett. Ital.*, XIX., 98, n. 2.

the recognized channel of the ridicule and wit of the Roman satirists.\* In essentials, however, the statue preserved its original academic character. It was decorated and dressed up only on the Feast of St. Mark (the 25th of April), when the literati, especially those attending the Roman University, fastened their epigrams to the pedestal. It is interesting to see how the current events of the day and antiquity disputed in their influence on the adornment of Pasquino. In 1512, under Julius II., the statue had been dressed as Mars; in 1513, under Leo X., it appeared as the Belvedere Apollo; in 1514, as Mercury; in 1515, as Orpheus; in 1516, as Proteus; in 1517, the year marked by the intercessory pilgrimages during the Turkish panic, it appeared in the garb of a pilgrim. A professor of the University was always the organizer of the festival, and a Cardinal its patron; and it was a novelty when the Pope—especially significant in the case of Leo X.—busied himself directly about the festival and spent money on it. Among the poems there were, it is true, some which indulged in vagaries and political attacks on the Curia and even on Leo X.; but these last were never directed against the spiritual authority of the Pope as such. On the contrary, Pasquino often attacked the extravagant doctrines of Luther.†

That the lampoons should increase under Leo X. was but one of the consequences of the culture of the time. Rome had always been famous for its satires, both learned and popular; but never since the time of the Emperors

\* See Vol. VI. of this work, 117, and FLAMINI, 550, for special literature. It is still undecided who effected the change of an academic into a satiric Pasquino: either Aretino or Antonio Lelio or—as suggests CESAREO (*Giorn. d. lett. Ital.*, XXXI., 408)—the Roman people. Cf. CIAN, *loc. cit.*, 423-424.

† See GNOLI, *Storia d. Pasquino*, 62 *seqq.*, 75, 283 *seqq.*, 293 *seq.*

had this kind of literature flourished so luxuriantly as now. In the multitude of Latin and Italian satires,\* scandal held a perfect orgy.† The “inconceivable liberty” which always prevailed is shown by the fact that repeatedly, and especially in 1513, 1515, 1516, and 1518, satires were spread about, couched in bitter language, and directed, not only against Cardinals, members of the Curia, and especially against the hated Florentines, but against Leo X. himself. Some of these were affixed to Pasquino, but the place where they had been printed was not stated, and the author concealed himself under the veil of anonymity.‡ In 1519 the festival of Pasquino was forbidden, to the great grief of the Roman literati;§ a poem affixed to Pasquino in 1520 deploras the unfortunate position of these men.|| On the other hand, another pasquinade affords indirect proof that the poets had cause to be satisfied with the liberality of the Pope.¶

If classical antiquity exercised this strong influence on satire and rhetoric, no less did it influence the writing of history, even when written in Italian. Indeed, the Italian historians are more penetrated by the spirit of antiquity than the most ardent Latinist, enamoured

\* Cf. CESAREO, *Nuova Antologia*, 3rd Series, LI. (1894), 90 *seqq.*, 105, 534, 537 *seqq.* About one of the most famous satires, the *Testamento dell' Elefante*, see ROSSI, *Intermezzo*, I. (1890), n. 28–30. About the *Sortes Vergilianae* of 1517, see LUZIO-RENIER in the *Giorn. d. lett. Ital.*, XLII., 87 *seqq.* In the same, Leo X. is handled with great irreverence.

† Cf. CESAREO, *loc. cit.*, 216–217.

‡ Cf. CESAREO, *loc. cit.*, 522 *seqq.*, 528; CIAN, *Giorn. d. lett. Ital.*, XVII., 335 *seqq.*; LUZIO-RENIER, *ibid.*, XIX, 93, and PERCOPO, *ibid.*, XXVIII., 49 *seqq.*

§ SANUTO, XXVII., 273.

|| GNOLI, 33.

¶ See for this in CESAREO, *Leone X. e Maestro Pasquino*, 199.

of Livy.\* The greater ones were personally known to Leo X., though he did not live to see the completion of their histories.

Francesco Guicciardini, who must be mentioned first, wrote his immortal History of Italy long after the days of Leo X.; but had, under the influence of the important events which were going on, mapped out the plan of his work during the lifetime of the Medici Pope.† From being an adversary of the Medici, he became their warm adherent when he was sent to Cortona to meet the Pope on his way to Bologna. Leo soon recognized the great talent of the highly-gifted man, and appointed Guicciardini consistorial advocate, and in 1516 made him Governor of Modena and Reggio.‡ It was his political advice that Leo should put on one side all other dangerous enterprises, for the sake of establishing a firm dominion in Florence, even under the outward semblance of republicanism.§

Machiavelli's ideas were quite different. This genial writer, as indifferent morally as Guicciardini, ranks with his compatriot by his most important works, "Discourses on the Roman History of Livy," and "The Art of War," which date from the time of Leo X. Machiavelli had been involved in the conspiracy of the Boscoli, and owed his pre-

\* Cf. BURCKHARDT, *Kultur*, I., 3rd ed., 290.

† About Guicciardini as an historian, see besides RANKE'S well-known criticisms, *Zur Kritik*, I *seqq.*; BENOIST, *Guichardin historien et homme d'état Ital.*, Paris, 1862; GEBHART, *Les historiens florentins de la Renaissance*, Paris, 1875. Cf. also GEOFFROY in the *Revue des Deux Mondes*, 1861 and 1874; TRÉVERRET, *L'Italie au XVI<sup>e</sup> siècle*, 2nd Series: *L'Arioste*; Guichardin, Paris, 1879; GIODA, *Guicciardini e le sue opere ined.*, Napoli, 1880; FLAMINI, 42 *seq.*, and 351; VILLARI, *Machiavelli*, III., 2, 481; *Giorn. d. lett. Ital.*, XXX., 497 *seq.*; *Histor. Zeitschrift*, LXXVIII., 207 *seq.*; CHIESI, 95 *seq.*

‡ Cf. *supra*, p. 43, n. I.

§ VILLARI-HEUSLER, *Machiavelli*, II., 48 *seq.*



servation to the clemency of Leo X. ; he now lived in the country near Florence, occupied with literature. At the end of 1513 he finished his famous book "Il Principe," which he dedicated to Lorenzo de' Medici, in the hopes of obtaining employment from him ;\* the plan fell through owing to the opposition of Cardinal Medici ; and in February, 1515, the latter expressly warned Giuliano against taking Machiavelli into his service.† However, the historian succeeded later in entering on closer relations with the Medici. In 1519 he received a request from Cardinal Giulio to give him his opinion in writing as to the best ways and means of improving the government of Florence. This opinion was to be submitted to the Pope, who, at that time, after the death of Lorenzo, was planning a re-arrangement of Florentine affairs. Machiavelli excused himself from complying with the request, because he advocated the restoration of the Republic, though in such a manner that Leo X. and Cardinal Medici would remain the real lords for as long as they lived.‡ When this singular opinion was set aside in Rome better days began to dawn for Machiavelli, in so far that at last he received some commissions from the Cardinal ; but they were so insignificant that they humiliated him more than they benefited him.§ A real proof of favour on the part of the Medici was shown him for the first time in November, 1520, when, for the consideration of an income of 100 gulden, he was charged with the writing of a history of

\* Cf. Vol. V. of this work, 161 *seq.*

† Manuscr. Torrig., XIX., 231.

‡ Discorso sopra il riformar lo stato di Firenze, fatto ad istanza di P. Leone [actually only indirectly, and asked directly only through the Cardinal ; see VILLARI-HEUSLER, II., 51, 52, 58.] Opere, IV., 105 *seqq.* Cf. GIODA, Machiavelli, Firenze, 1874, 159 *seqq.* ; FESTER, 121.

§ VILLARI-HEUSLER, II., 58 *seq.*

Florence. This arrangement was in great part due to the far-seeing Cardinal Giulio, who, as Archbishop of Florence, was at the head of the University, and in virtue of a Bull of Leo X. of the 31st of January, 1515, had the power of conferring academic degrees and dignities.\* This historical work of Machiavelli was never seen by Leo; but, on the other hand, he read a part at least of that written by Paolo Giovio.

Paolo Giovio, the third of the great national historians, who described the age of Leo X., was born at Como in 1483, had been the pupil of Pomponazzi in Padua, and had at Pavia gained a doctor's degree in medicine.† The fame of the liberality of the Medici Pope lured him to Rome.‡ There he went on with his practice of medicine,§ though he was really far more interested in the study of contemporary history. Few places in the world are so well suited for this study as is the Eternal City. The items of news which were always streaming in from all parts were discussed by Giovio with a friend who took the same unbounded interest as himself in news of this kind. This was Marino Sanuto, the author of the great collection of diaries which form such an inexhaustible fund for the making of contemporary history. Giovio planned a great

\* VILLARI-HEUSLER, II., 110 *seq.*

† *Cf.* TIRABOSCHI, VII., 2, 242 *seqq.*

‡ From TIRABOSCHI (*loc. cit.*) onward to GREGOROVIVS (VIII, 314) it was accepted that Giovio came first to Rome in 1516. But the fact is that Giovio was a professor at the Roman University as early as 1514 (see *infra*). *Cf.* also his letter from Rome in May, 1514 (MARINI, Lettera, III); letter to Sanuto, dat. Bologna, 1515, Dec. 15 (SANUTO, XXI., 391 *seqq.*) See also CIAN in the *Giorn. d. lett. Ital.*, XVII., 333 *seqq.*

§ For a knowledge of Giovio's character, *cf.* the very important and not sufficiently known publication of LUZIO, *Lettere di Giovio*, 21 and 47 *seqq.* See also MARINI, *Lettere*, 43.

historical work which was to comprise all countries. His project was to narrate in Latin all the occurrences of the world which had taken place since the expedition of Charles VIII. into Italy. A more suitable beginning could not have been chosen than this event, which led to a complete dislocation in the condition of the States of Europe.\* A portion of this work was finished as early as 1514; and Giovio had the honour of reading it to Leo X., who was immensely pleased. Since Livy, he is reported to have said, no one has written so elegantly and fluently. Knighthood and a professorship at the Roman University† were the immediate rewards of the fortunate author, who accompanied the Pope to Bologna in 1515. Thence he wrote to Sanuto that he could think of nothing but the completion and publication of his work.‡ It was not, however, till 1550, two years before his death, that Giovio's book began to appear in print. Copies in manuscript had already been circulated; but Giovio worked on indefatigably at improving the work, and turned in all directions for fresh material.§

Giovio's work shared the fate of all important histories, and was subjected to very divers judgments; belauded by some to the heavens, by many others it was equally depreciated. These attacks Giovio has made public in his too frank confessions both by word and letter. As a true humanist he was profoundly convinced that he was the

\* Cf. Vol. V. of this work, 434 *seq.*

† Giovio was made professor of rhetoric. It would have been more suitable had he been given the post mentioned on p. 223 *supra*. This was received by F. Maddaleni di Capodiferro, celebrated for his poems. RENAZZI, II., 14, 234-235. This appointment illustrated the casual and dilettante character of Leo's patronage. It was not Giovio, but a poet who had to be supported, who received the post.

‡ SANUTO, XXI., 393; TIRABOSCHI, VII., 2, 242 *seqq.*

§ Cf. LUZIO, Lettere, 8, 17 *seqq.*

dispenser of fame, and wished to make his work as useful as possible. With cynical vaunting he declared that he had written according as he had been paid, and had therefore clothed some in gold brocade and others in sackcloth.\* The same man who expressed opinions so reprehensible in a historian, spoke bitter home-truths to his greatest patron, although he was being constantly and richly remunerated by him. His work became the model and chief source drawn on by all political writers of that time in Italy, though the book was censured by many, simply from envy.†

Giovio's history throws valuable light on the moral aspect of his own life.‡ Some confidential letters in the years 1522 and 1523 prove that at that time Giovio led the same life of enjoyment as was led by so many of his contemporaries.§ But besides the pleasures of a lower sort which the Rome of Leo X. afforded, there were others which were more noble. Among these, the one to which Giovio devoted himself was that of collecting works of art, especially portraits, which were the beginning of his museum, at a later date so famous.|| He delighted,

\* For these and other passages, see TIRABOSCHI, VII., 2, 247 *seq.* Cf. the highly characteristic letter in LUZIO, 23, who at p. 13 draws this conclusion: "Non dunque una sfacciata venalità ma un desiderio molto pratico di non lavorare per la sola gloria."

† Cf. RANKE, *Zur Kritik*, 72 *seq.* See also LUZIO, 23, n. 1; CIAN, *Giorn. d. lett. Ital.*, XXXVII., 356; and SANESI, *the Arch. stor. Ital.*, 5th Series, XXIII., 260 *seq.*

‡ This has already been pointed out by ROSCOE-HENKE, III., 367. Cf. also REUMONT, III., 2, 340.

§ See LUZIO, *Lettere*, II, 21, 27 *seqq.* The character of Giovio is drawn by CIAN, most excellently and in a few lines, in the *Giorn. d. lett. Ital.*, XVII., 278 *seqq.*

|| Cf. FOSSATI, *Il Museo Gioviano*, Como, 1892; MÜNTZ, *Le musée de portraits de P. Jove*, Paris, 1900; CIAN, *Giorn. d. lett. Ital.*,



moreover, in social intercourse with all the intellectual and learned men who lived in the Eternal City. The memory of the joyous time which Giovio then spent in Rome, lights up, like a gleam of sunshine, the picture drawn by him of his exalted patron and his own æsthetic enjoyment of life. However much this history, in which the darker side of the Medici Pope is almost entirely overlooked, may be open to criticism, it makes us understand how for a whole century it influenced the reading world of the West. In no other work is there put before us in such vivid colours that joyous and brilliant spirit of the time of Leo X., in which the enjoyment of antiquity interwove itself with and stamped all other enjoyments, and gave such a special mark to life in Rome.\*

XXVIII., 174 *seqq.* ; HAGELSTANGE, *Holzschnitts-porträts der Visconti*, in *Anz. des germ. Museums*, 1904 ; and F. SERVAES in the *Neuen Freien Presse*, 1905, No. 14508.

\* Cf. BURCKHARDT, I., 3rd ed., 231, 265. He remarks in another place (II., 3rd ed., 51) that "the spirit of the age permeates his pages ; his Leo, his Alfonso, his Pompeo Colonna, live and move before us, truly and forcibly, even though their innermost nature is kept hidden from us." See also GEIGER, in the *Zeitschr. f. Renaissance-Lit.*, I., 150.

## CHAPTER VI.

STUDY OF ANTIQUITY.—RAPHAEL AND THE PLAN OF ANCIENT ROME.—ENCOURAGEMENT OF THE STUDY OF GREEK.—THE VATICAN LIBRARY AND THE ROMAN UNIVERSITY.

LEO'S classical tendencies must have benefited the science of antiquity. One of its chief representatives, Latino Giovenale Manetti, was soon known as Bembo's friend.\* No less close were the relations which bound this noble patrician, who was also of some note as a poet, with Sadoletto, Sanga, Trissino, Castiglione, and especially with Cardinal Bibbiena.† It is certain that at that time Manetti laid the foundation of his collection of statues which made his house in the Campo de' Fiori a resort for all sight-seers. This man, as learned as he was clever, was often employed by Leo X. on diplomatic missions; in 1514 he was sent to Ferrara, in 1515 to northern Italy, in 1516 to Germany, and in 1517 to Venice.‡ Several benefices, among others a canonry of St. Peter's, were the reward of his faithful services.§

In 1521 Leo X. had the joy of seeing the appearance in print of the first collection of Roman topographical inscriptions. Jacopo Mazocchi,|| the indefatigable printer

\* *Cf. supra*, p. 194.

† *Cf.* MARINI, I., 384 *seq.*; CIAN, Cortegiano, 229.

‡ *Cf.* Regest. Leonis X., n. 7504, 12,009, 16,331; MARINI, I., 384, 385, II., 353; PIEPER, Nuntiaturen, 49, 52; CHIESI, 34.

§ See Regest. Leonis X., n. 7948, 16,331.

|| About Mazocchi, see LANCIANI, I., 183, 201.

of the Roman University, who was himself a learned man, published it. The Pope, by whom Mazocchi was always gladly received, had by privilege protected the work against piracy on November 30, 1517. This collection, in which the previous works of the Veronese Fra Giocondo and Pietro Sabino were utilized, was compiled by the learned Canon, Francesco Albertini, the author of the little work dedicated to Julius II. "on the marvels of ancient and modern Rome."\* It embraces both ancient and early Christian inscriptions, and is, as can be easily understood, neither correct nor perfect; nevertheless, it deserves high commendation, and rescued many fragments, since lost, introducing a new epoch in Roman epigraphy.†

An interest in Egyptian antiquities was springing up, having been apparently awakened by the obelisks in Rome. Pierio Valeriano, who was also a poet, busied himself with the symbolism of the hieroglyphics, and published an important work on them. In 1521 Leo entrusted Valeriano, who was versed in Latin and Greek literature, with the education of his nephews Ippolito and Alessandro.‡

Andrea Fulvio, who, in an official document, is explicitly called "an antiquarian," belongs also to the time of the Medici Pope. As early as 1513, he dedicated to Leo X. a description of the antiquities of Rome, written in Latin

\* Cf. Vol. VI. of this work, 501 *seq.*

† See HENZEN in the *Monatsberichten der Berl. Akad.*, 1868, 403 *seqq.*

‡ About Pierio Valeriano (Giampietro Bolzani), cf. TICOZZI, *Storia dei lett. del dipartimento della Piave*, Belluno, 1813, 85 *seqq.*; TIRABOSCHI, VII., 2, 220 *seqq.*; ROSCOE-BOSSI, X., 115 *seqq.*; GREGOROVIVS, VIII., 307 *seq.*; *Giorn. d. lett. Ital.*, XXIX., 445, XXXIX., 233 *seqq.*; G. CALI, *Della vita e delle opere di Giov. Pierio Valeriano*, Catania, 1901.

hexameters.\* A description of the ancient city in prose was, by the special direction of the Pope, made from this; it appeared in the time of Clement VII., and formed an important step in the knowledge of antiquity. In 1517 Fulvio brought out a book on numismatics, the excellent wood-cuts of which were protected against imitation by a special Papal privilege.† Full of gratitude, the learned antiquary eulogized the Medici Pope in a Latin poem, as the ornament of the Roman See, and dedicated to him an eclogue on the Nativity of Christ.‡

The extensive learning of Fulvio was as highly appreciated by Raphael as it was by the Pope. The great painter repaid the services which Fulvio rendered him by his antiquarian studies, by standing his friend as an architectural expert. Fulvio was not the only one whose knowledge was utilized by Raphael, who was so indefatigable in learning everything he could on every kind of subject. He had, for instance, had Vitruvius translated into Italian by the aged Mario Fabio Calvo of Ravenna.§ Raphael || visited the remains of ancient Rome with these two companions, being often joined by Baldas-

\* *Antiquaria Urbis per A. Fulvium, Romae* (J. Mazochius), 1513; Panzer, VIII., 252; Graesse, Trésor, II., 646.

† A. Fulvius, *Illustrium imagines, Romae* (J. Mazochius), 1517, 8<sup>vo</sup>. In this copyright Leo bestows the highest praise on the publisher. This publication is one of the chief examples of wood-cuts executed in Rome in the time of Leo X. It is worthy of the examination of an expert.

‡ \*Cod. 15,429, f. 1-4 of the Court Library, Vienna.

§ \*Cod. ital., 37, *a, b, c.*, Court Library, Munich. In opposition to the doubt raised by GREGOROVIVS (VIII., 309), LANCIANI (*Rendiconti d. Accad. dei Lincei, Cl. scienze mor.*, 5th Series, III., 803) considers it certain that the marginal notes of the manuscript are written by Raphael himself. About Calvo, see \*Mazzuchelli in *Cod. Vatic.*, 9263, f. 275*b*, Vatican Library.

|| Cf. LOEWY, in *Archiv. stor. dell' arte*, 1896, 241 *seq.*



sare Castiglione, the cultured diplomatist who always took such a lively interest in everything that was going on in Rome at that time. In this little circle a project was started into which Leo X. threw himself with zest. This was nothing less than the making of a great archæological plan of ancient Rome with explanatory text, worked out from existing remains, new excavations, and the testimony of ancient writers. This was the origin of the letter\* on the antiquities of Rome, addressed to Leo X., and ascribed first to Castiglione, later to Raphael, and by others to Fulvio or Fra Giocondo. No doubt the correct view to take is that this highly-interesting document embodies the ideas of Raphael, put into shape by the experienced pen of Castiglione.†

\* There are two versions of this : the one, published from a manuscript of Sc. Maffei, appeared first in the Paduan edition of the works of Castiglione, 1733, and was published separately by P. E. Visconti (Roma, 1834), and again by PASSAVANTI (Raffaël, I., 539). Schmeller found in the Court Library, Munich, a second and somewhat later version, with a few important differences and additions, published by PASSAVANTI, III., 43 *seqq.* I agree with REUMONT, III., 2, 358 *seqq.*, in following the second version, dating from the last period of Raphael's life. GREGOROVIVS (VIII., 310) fixes the letter in 1518 or 1519.

† The original opinion, that Castiglione composed the report, was successfully combated by D. FRANCESCONI (Congettura che una lettera credita di B. Castiglione sia di Raffaello d'Urbino, Firenze, 1799). Since then Raphael has been regarded as the real author. At first H. Grimm tried to prove the impossibility of this (see Zahn's *Jahrbücher für Kunstwissenschaft.*, 1871, 67 *seqq.*). Whereas this Berlin student maintained that Fulvio was the author, Springer inclined to its being Fra Giocondo. Against both of these MÜNTZ, (Raphaël, 604 *seqq.*) strongly urged the claims of Raphael. Müntz has most happily disposed of the chronological difficulties which seemed at first to upset Raphael's claims to authorship. That the actual form belongs to Castiglione is no more denied by Müntz than it is by Francesconi. The same opinion is held by PLATNER, I., 266 ; ROSCOE-BOSSI, IX., 265, XI., 172 *seq.*; GRUYER, Raphaël et l'antiquité, .I,

The document is marked by the most ardent veneration for antiquity and its wonderful remains in Rome, the "Queen of the world." Therefore, the "Goths and Vandals" and the "shameless barbarians" who, in their ignorance, have destroyed the witnesses of the greatness and power of the ancient Romans, so that nothing remains but the skeleton stripped of its flesh, are all condemned. If in this Raphael adheres to the unhistorical ideas which prevailed at the end of the Middle Ages,\* he is impartial enough to bear in mind the guilt of the Romans themselves, both during that period and at the time of the Renaissance. With noble candour he goes on to say: "How many Popes, Holy Father, possessing the same dignity as Your Holiness, but not the same knowledge, ability, and high-mindedness, whereby you bear within you the image of God—how many have demolished the ancient temples, statues, triumphal arches, and other magnificent buildings! How many have ordered the foundations to be dug for the sake of the puzzolano, quite regardless that the fall of the superstructure must follow! How many have reduced ancient pillars and marble ornaments to lime! The new Rome, which we now see standing in all its beauty and grandeur, adorned with palaces, churches, and other buildings, is built throughout with the lime obtained in this way from ancient marbles." Full of grief, Raphael contemplates how, even since his own twelve years' sojourn in the Eternal City, the ruins of the so-called Meta of Romulus in the Castle of St. Angelo, the arches at the entrance of the Baths of Diocletian, the Temple of Ceres in the Via Sacra, and, quite recently, a portion of

452; REUMONT, III., 2, 358; JANITSCHKE in Lit. Zentralblatt, 1882, 516; MINGHETTI (168) and LANCIANI (792, n. 2) in the treatise mentioned, *infra*, p. 248 n.

\* Cf. GRISAR, Geschichte Roms., I., 94.

the Forum of Nerva, as well as a number of the columns, friezes, and architraves, and the greater part of the basilicas in the Roman Forum, had been destroyed: "a barbarity which dishonours our age, and worse than which Hannibal could not have done." Raphael therefore appeals to the Pope to protect the remains of "the great mother of fame and the greatness of Italy," so that the witnesses of the dignity and genius of those "sublime minds, the very thought of which stirs up those yet alive to higher things, may not be spoiled and destroyed by the evil-minded and ignorant."

With characteristic boldness Raphael makes an intellectual survey of the development of architecture in antiquity, the Middle Ages, and during the Renaissance. To him the antique is the one model to which no one has since attained; he holds German Gothic architecture as so much rubbish in comparison.\* There follows an explanation based on the observation and measurement of ancient buildings.†

It was his intention to complete the plan of the city in fourteen sheets, each of which was to embrace one of the regions of the Emperor Augustus. In fixing the boundaries of these, Raphael had the assistance of Andrea Fulvio as well as Mario Fabio Calvo.‡ Contemporaries

\* It is worthy of notice that, in spite of the depreciation of Gothic architecture, shared by Raphael with most of his fellow-countrymen, "a gleam of appreciation of Teutonic architecture is perceptible in him." See REUMONT, III., 2, 359; *cf.* MÜNTZ, 608 *seqq.* See also Mitteil. der k. k. Zentralkomm. in Vienna, III. (1858), 321 *seqq.* Raphael's contempt for everything Gothic was connected with his aversion for "the barbarians"; see MESTICA, *La cultura ed i sentimenti politici di Raffaello*, in the *Nuova Antologia*, 1899, Feb. 16.

† *Cf.* BURCKHARDT, *Kultur*, I., 3rd ed., 231.

‡ Besides KÜHLEN (Calvo and Calcagnini, in connection with Raphael, in the *Kunstbl.*, 1844, Nos. 46-47), *cf.* especially LANCIANI, *La*

ascribed the whole work to Raphael alone, and all friends of antiquity followed its progress with the greatest interest. The learned Celio Calcagnini, who in a Latin poem extolled the "inspired" excavating of ruined Rome,\* wrote to his friend Jakob Ziegler: "Raphael is at present occupied with an admirable work which will be the wonder of posterity. He is drawing plans of the city of Rome which reproduce almost in their entirety its ancient aspect, its former extent, and the exact details of each part. For this purpose he has caused excavations to be made in the hills and among deep-lying foundations, comparing the results obtained with the descriptions and measurements of ancient writers. This work has impressed Pope Leo and all classes of Romans with such admiration that the

*pianta di Roma antica e i disegni archeol. di Raffaello Sanzio*, in the *Rendic. d. R. Accad. dei Lincei*, Cl. scienze mor., 5th Series, III. (1894), 795 *seqq.* After Raphael's death his friends continued the work through Fulvio as far as the text was concerned, while Calvo worked at the drawings. The "Antiquitates" of Fulvio and the Plan of Calvo appeared in 1527. Of the latter (M. Fabius Calvus, *Antiquae Urbis cum regionibus Simulachrum*, Romae, Ludov. Vicentinus, 1527). Lanciani has discovered the only copy which has escaped destruction, in the *Libr. Vitt. Eman.* (Collez. Rom., 3, G. 21). According to the opinion of the above-named student, we must recollect that Calvo and Raphael carried on their researches into Roman topography in the closest union, the reason being that the fatherhood of the work, excellent in idea, though faulty in execution, belonged entirely to Raphael. Calvo's Plan was that one, the publication of which was expected, when he once co-operated with and worked under the patronage of Raphael. The many efforts (*cf.* ROSSI, *Piante di Roma*, 113) to find Raphael's autograph on it remained unsuccessful, according to Lanciani, because it had never existed. C. V. FABRICZY (*Repert. f. Kunstwiss.*, XIX., 494 *seq.*) seems inclined to agree with this conclusion. Aretino's ridicule of the Plan is mentioned by GNOLI, *Secolo*, II., 650.

\* ROSCOE-BOSSI, XI., 93 n. *Cf.* also the verses of Caius Silvanus Germanicus, quoted by GNOLI in the *Arch. dell. Arte*, II., 250.



originator is looked upon as a more than mortal being, sent down from heaven to restore to the Eternal City her pristine glory." \* Great, therefore, in proportion to their expectations, was the grief of the educated world when Raphael's premature death interrupted his labours. In verses that attained celebrity Castiglione bewailed the envious fate that had snatched from their midst the resuscitator of the Rome of old.† The noble Venetian, Marcantonio Michiel, emphasized, in a letter of April 15th, 1520, the loss sustained in an equal degree by painting as well as architecture: "What Ptolemy did for the world, Raphael has done for the ancient buildings of Rome, restoring their form, proportions, and ornaments so clearly that to look on his drawings is, seemingly, to gaze on the ancient city. He has already finished the first Region, reproducing not only the ground-plan and situation of the buildings according to measurements obtained by careful examination of their remains, but also their façade, from data afforded by a close study of Vitruvius, and of the rules of ancient architecture, along with a comparison of the early writers."‡

While classical studies were thus pursued with ardour in Leonine Rome, philosophy and theology had to content themselves with a modest status. The dangerous trend of opinion which Pietro Pomponazzi had followed in the former domain of study had led to his condemnation in the Lateran Council.§

\* C. CALCAGNINI, Opera, Basil., 1544, 101. About Calcagnini, *cf.* LUZIO-RENIER in Giorn. d. lett. Ital., XXXV., 240 *seq.*

† B. Castil. Carmina, Romae, 1760, 150; ROSCOE-BOSSI, XI., 92.

‡ SANUTO, XXVIII., 424.

§ See Vol. V. of this work, 155 *seq.*, and *infra*, p. 389 *seq.* It is remarkable what distinction Pomponazzi enjoyed in spite of his condemnation. *Cf.* Costa in the Atti p. l., Romagna, 1903, 287 ff. Bembo,

Pomponazzi's keenest opponent, Agostino Nifo,\* received a call from Leo X. to the Roman University; he was repeatedly marked out for honours and titles by the Pope.† While Nifo was chiefly busied with the writings of Aristotle, Gianfrancesco Pico della Mirandola stepped forward as an opponent of the Stagirite and as an enthusiastic admirer of Plato. In other respects also these two men of learning stood poles asunder; Nifo supported lax ethical views; Pico was a man of stern morality. Leo X. showed repeated marks of sympathy with Pico in the misfortune which he had to fight against; the latter, in grateful recognition, dedicated to the Pope his work on Divine Love.‡ Special mention ought to be made here of Egidio Canisio of Viterbo, who was made a Cardinal by Leo X., as the composer of a work in which he sought to expound a philosophy of secular and ecclesiastical history before and after the Incarnation.§ The whole is a curious and

it is well known, interceded with the Pope for Pomponazzi. About Cardinal Medici as an opponent of the book against Immortality, see Atti, p. 1., Romagna, VI., 148.

\* Cf. TIRABOSCHI, VII., 1, 339 *seq.*, and IX., 305; MARINI, Archiatri, I., 289, and Lettera, 40; ROSCOE-BOSSI, IX., 111 *seqq.*, 229 *seq.*, XII., 239; TUOZZI, A Nifo e le sue opere, in the Atti d. Accad. di Padova, N. S., XX., (1904). The opinion recently supported by CORSO in the Riv. calab, X., 1902, that Nifo was born in Ioppolo (Iopolo) must be mistaken.

† See MARINI, Archiatri, I., 289. Concerning the philosopher Francesco Diaceto, patronized by Leo X., see CIAN, Cortegiano, 83; about the Spanish philosopher, Juan Montesdoch, who was summoned to Rome, see Atti, p. 1., Romagna, 1903, 293 *seqq.*; cf. Appendix, No. 2.

‡ Cf. TIRABOSCHI, VII., 1, 355. For Gianfrancesco Pico, see also this work, Vol. V., 216, VI., 342, 616, and VII., p. 5 *seq.* The dedication copy of his writing, "De divino amore," is in the Laurentian Library; see BANDINIUS, III., 518.

§ Historia viginti saeculorum per totidem psalmos conscripta; Cod. C 8, 19, of the Angelica Library at Rome. This MS. (cf. NARDUCCI,

often confused medley\* of historical narrative and philosophical, philological, moral, exegetical and allegorical commentaries; the latter treat of the prophecies of the Old Testament. Not only are the autobiographical passages valuable, but also the copious information concerning contemporary Popes. On many of them he passes judgment with a noble candour which contrasts strangely with the unstinted praise which he lavishes, like an accomplished courtier, on Leo X. This work also claims particular attention, as showing how deeply humanist ideas had affected the views even of ecclesiastics of rigid orthodoxy.†

The Neapolitan Ambrogio Fiandino, of the Augustinian

Catal., 177; see also the same, 223, for Cod. D 8, 6.) I have made use of. PÉLISSIER, *Rev. d. Biblioth.*, II., 238 *seqq.*, quotes from an MS. in the National Library, Naples (IX., B. 14, *cf.* OSSINGER, 194; Montfaucon, I., 232), in which he sees the original. Another and third MS., which Péliissier came across, is to be found in the Dresden Library; this HÖFLER made use of (*Archiv f. österr. Gesch.*, 1854, 378 *seq.*). Leo Africanus, the Arab geographer, was in 1517 captured and delivered up to the Pope; he was converted to Christianity, Leo X. conferring his own name upon him and granting him a pension. His work on Africa is still of value: German translation by LORSBACH, *Merkwürdige Beschreibung von Africa*, Bd. I., Herborn, 1805; English by R. BROWN, in works issued by the Hakluyt Soc., 1st Series, n. 92-94, London, 1906; French by A. SCHEFER, Paris, 1896-99.

\* I cannot support the conjecture that the work—as we have it—is probably only a first draft.

† *Cf.* the keen and searching criticism of PÉLISSIER, *De opere historico Aegidii card. Viterb., Hist. viginti saecul., Monspeli*, 1896. The work is not so generally unknown as Péliissier thinks. On the contrary, it has often been used; thus, by Victorellus in CIACONIUS, II., 551, 590; MANNI, *Anni Santi*, 48; GEORGIUS, *Nicolaus V.*, 66, 76; BALUZE, *Vitae*, I, 625; further by HÖFLER, *loc. cit.*; LAEMMER, *Zur Kirchengeschichte*, 66 *seq.*; TOMMASINI in *Arch. d. Soc. Rom.*, III., 77; and lastly in the present work, Vols. I. to VI. The panegyric remarks of Egidio on Leo X. are quite appropriate to the letter of the latter, which ULLMANN quotes, *Studien*, 95 *seq.*

Order, who was appointed suffragan Bishop of Mantua by Leo in 1517, forms a link between philosophy and theology; Fiandino also wrote several books against Luther. The first work which appeared against Luther in Italy came from the Order which also in Germany produced so many opponents of the Wittenberg reformer.\* It was by Silvestro Prierias, Leo's Master of the Sacred Palace; of his activity we have already spoken.† To these names may be added, among Luther's earliest antagonists in Italy, those of the Dominicans, Ambrogio Catarino and Tommaso Rhadino, professors at the University of Rome, and also the Venetian Christoforo Marcello.‡ The pre-eminence in theology must undoubtedly be accorded to Cardinal Cajetan among the celebrities of the Court of Leo X. Almost all the writings of this remarkable man, who was called by Clement VII. the "light of the Church," were composed in Rome. Cajetan's reputation rests chiefly on his classical commentary on the "Summa" of St. Thomas Aquinas, and on his learned treatise on the authority of Popes and Councils, which had already been composed under Julius II. He was also the author of many occasional pamphlets, in which he defended, with great moderation and sound

\* Cf. PAULUS, *Die Deutschen Dominikaner im Kampfe gegen Luther* (1518, bis 1563), Freiburg i. Br., 1903. To the Dominican Order also belonged Sante Pagnini da Lucca, whose translation of the Bible was eagerly encouraged by Leo X. RENAZZI, II., 13-14.

† Vol. VII. of this work, pp. 363 *seq.*, 392 *seq.*

‡ Cf. for these and also others, KALKOFF, *Aleander*, 221, and *Forschungen*, 176 *seq.* For Catarino, cf. besides *Kirchenlexicon*, II., 2nd ed., 2053, also MARINI, *Lettera*, 28, and LAEMMER, *Vortrid.* Theol., 21; see also FRAKNÓI, *Verböczi*, 160 *seq.*, and *supra*, p. 24. For the Dominican Pietro Colonna, named Galatino from his home, who wrote, in 1518, a treatise on "Catholic Truth" against the Jews, see TIRABOSCHI, VII., 1, 308.



judgment, the ancient teaching of the Church against the Lutheran innovations.\* Along with Cajetan, Alberto Pio di Carpi may also be mentioned as a distinguished theologian in his day. Carpi, like many other learned men who were also strong churchmen, was an opponent of Erasmus of Rotterdam, the most celebrated and the most noteworthy scholar of his age.†

Erasmus, during his sojourn in Rome in 1509, was on a familiar footing with the Cardinals and also a frequent visitor at the palace of Giovanni de' Medici. On intimate terms they could hardly have ever been, which explains why, on the elevation of Leo to the Papacy, no invitation was given to Erasmus to accompany him to Rome. Erasmus, however, himself allowed full two years to pass before he renewed his relations with Leo. Then he certainly gave way to the coarsest flattery and most abject servility. From London, on the 28th of April, 1515, he addressed a long and inflated letter to the Pope. He begins by making excuses for his boldness in approaching a man who is now as highly exalted over his fellow-men as they are over the brute creation. "Oh! that it were granted to me to prostrate myself at your blessed feet, and to impress my kisses on them." After this preamble Erasmus indulges in the loudest strains of praise of the whole house of Medici, and of the Pope, their most illustrious member, who has equal claims to be considered the patron

\* See JÄGER, "Kajetans kampf gegen die lutherische Lehrform, aus seinen Traktaten dargelegt," in *Niedners Zeitschrift. f. histor. Theol.*, 1858, 431 *seqq.* Cf. also Echard et Quétif, II., 14 *seq.*; HURTER, *Nomenclator*; WERNER, *Der Hl. Thomas von Aquin*, III., 251 *seq.*; SCHEEBEN in *Kirchenlexicon*, III., 2nd ed., 1675 *seq.*; JENKINS, *Pre-Tridentine Doctrine*; a review of the *Commentary on the Scriptures of Thomas de Vio*, London, 1891, and A. COSSIO, II. *Card. Gaetano e la riforma*, I., Cividade, 1902.

† Cf. HESS, I., 301 *seq.*

of science as well as the prince of peace. As a special favour he begs permission to dedicate his edition of St. Jerome to the Sovereign Pontiff.\*

Such a tribute of homage from the most celebrated humanist of the day must have been a cause of the most pleasurable satisfaction to the Medici Pope. He accepted the dedication of the St. Jerome and also that of the Greek New Testament; at the same time he introduced Erasmus to Henry VIII. of England.† Still, a summons to the Papal Court, which Erasmus, who was then longing to revisit Rome, might have expected, did not come. On the other hand, Leo X. complied with another request which the notable scholar had tendered through the English Nuncio, Andreas Ammonius. Erasmus had dispensed himself from his monastic vows and had fallen under excommunication; further, owing to his illegitimate birth, he was disqualified for Church preferment. These were difficult circumstances in which Papal favour would be helpful; therefore, Erasmus pledged his word that, for the future, he would never publish a sheet which did not set forth the praise of the good and great Pope Leo.‡

What importance was attached in Rome to the gratification of the wishes of the first literary celebrity of the day may be seen in the delicate and considerate way in which his petitions were granted. At the end of January, 1517, three dispensations were issued, two of which were so worded that no one could infer that Erasmus's birth was in any way tainted, or why he had incurred ecclesiastical censure.§

\* ERASMI, Op. III., I, 149; HARTFELDER, Erasmus, 129 *seq.*

† ERASMI, Op. III., I, 156 *seq.*

‡ ERASMI, Op. III., I, 159; HARTFELDER, 131.

§ One Brief is in ERASMI, Op. III., I, 166. The two others are to be found in VISCHER, *Erasmiana*, 26 *seqq.*; *cf.* also JANSSEN-PASTOR, II., 18th ed., 7, n. 3, and HARTFELDER, 132 *seq.*

Erasmus promised, in his letter of thanks, to be bound "hand and foot" henceforward to promote the glory of the Pope who had brought back the "golden age" of piety and learning.\*

The subsequent relations between the greatest scholar and the greatest patron of learning of the age remained unimpaired. They were not altered even when rumours were rife in Rome pointedly accusing Erasmus of being the instigator and encourager of the Lutheran errors. That his conduct in this respect was open to attack was felt even by Erasmus himself. He therefore made haste to clear himself from any sort of suspicion by the strongest assurances of loyalty; with great adroitness he struck a note in his apologetic writings which was sure to find an echo in the mind of Leo X. He represented his opponents as the enemies of learning; they only attacked him because he made the cause of learning his own. "From their birth these men have hated the Muses and the Graces; they wage an endless war against studies which they are incapable of understanding; likewise they cry, Religion—of which they consider themselves naturally to be the pillars—is in danger." But through all Erasmus is determined in his writings to keep clear of error; he asserts with emphasis: "However insignificant my talents may be, they are dedicated once and for all to Christ; to His glory alone are they devoted, and to the service of the Roman Church and its head; especially to the service of Your Holiness, to whom I am under endless obligation."†

As his accusers, with Aleander at their head, were far from being silenced, Erasmus turned once more to the Pope himself. Dishonest men, he writes to the latter on the

\* HARTFELDER, 133.

† Letter of August 13, 1519, ERASMI, Op. III., 1, 490; cf. HARTFELDER, 134 *seq.*

13th of September, 1520, in their enmity towards the beauty of learning, seek to calumniate him as the champion of Reuchlin and Luther. Nothing is more untrue; he has no acquaintance with Luther; he has not even read his writings, with the exception of some ten or twelve pages, on which he bestowed only a casual glance. He admits that this scanty perusal gave him the impression that Luther had it in him to become a Biblical interpreter after the manner of the ancients; but as soon as he became aware of the uneasiness which he was causing, he felt such aversion that he persuaded the printer Froben, with threats, to discontinue the issue of such works. Moreover, he had earnestly begged his friends to exhort Luther to observe moderation and the interests of the peace of the Church. "Two years before, when Luther first wrote to me, I reminded him in affectionate terms of what I wished him to avoid; would that he had listened to that advice! I apprehend that this letter was conveyed to Your Holiness, with the result that I have forfeited your esteem, although, really, it ought rather to have secured to me the Papal approval." Finally, Erasmus defended himself against the objection that he had not yet written anything against Luther. In the first place, he had not had time to make a thorough study of Luther's writings, neither had he the necessary qualifications; further, he had no wish to anticipate the theological faculties who were occupied with the matter; lastly, he admitted the principal cause of his silence: his fear lest he should draw down upon himself an ever-increasing weight of odium.\*

This letter seems to have had the desired effect, at least as regards Leo X. The latter, replying on the 16th of January, 1521, said that doubts had arisen in his mind concerning the opinions of Erasmus, not only from what he

\* ERASMI Op. III., I, 578; HARTFELDER, 135 *seq.*



had been told by very shrewd and well-informed men, but from some of his own writings. All such impressions had been obliterated by this letter, and he had no longer any hesitation regarding his loyalty to the See of Peter and the teaching of the Church. He wished that all might be as firmly convinced of that teaching as Erasmus was. At the same time he enjoined upon him to use his talents and learning in combating the Lutheran doctrine.\*

From the letters of Cardinal Medici to Aleander, in the autumn of 1521, it is clear that the former, notwithstanding all reports prejudicial to Erasmus, remained of the opinion that the latter ought to be treated with the utmost consideration and leniency.† In this respect the furthest limits were reached and, perhaps, overstepped. Moreover, at an even later date Adrian VI. himself had not lost hope of winning, as an apologist of the Church against the Reformers, the greatest Latinist of the day and the most accomplished penman in Christendom. Even if the praises given by Erasmus to the services rendered by Leo X. to learning were exaggerated, they were yet in one respect, to some extent, justified—namely, as regards the study of Greek. In this instance the protection which the Pope in part extended to the Venetian press of Aldus Manutius (born 1450, died 1515) is remarkable. Aldus was no ordinary publisher; he was at the same time a man of learning and also a staunch adherent of his religion. He expressly undertook, in the preface to his edition of Lucretius, to reject from it everything that was contrary to the tenets of theology. His reverence for the Holy See was evidenced in another way, since, in his issue of the works of Petrarch, he omitted all the passionate sonnets levelled

\* BALAN, Mon. ref., n. 53, 129-130; also, with slight differences, in LAEMMER, Mon. vat, I *seq.*

† BALAN, *loc. cit.*, 292 *seqq.*

against Rome. The editions published by Aldus Manutius, for which with business-like ability he knew how to open up entirely new markets, were generally prized for their accuracy and elegance. The business of the firm, which soon became world-renowned, had, for that age, an unwontedly universal character; he deserves special credit for his successful efforts to supply the want of Greek books.\* Soon after Leo's accession, the edition of Plato, prepared by Marcus Musurus,† began to appear from his press. The first part of this remarkable publication was adorned, together with a fine Greek poem by Musurus, by the spirited dedication of Aldus, to which attention has already been called. The Pope was delighted; nothing more appropriate could have been offered to the son of Lorenzo de' Medici. He expressed his thanks in a testimonial dated the 28th of November, 1513. In it he commends the unwearied diligence with which for years Aldus had bestowed labour and money on the publication of works of learning; in consideration of which he confers upon him for fifteen years the exclusive privilege of printing and publishing all Latin and Greek works which have already been or shall hereafter be issued by him, in the beautiful cursive type of his invention; all copyists and imitators are threatened with heavy fines and ecclesi-

\* Cf. A. FIRMIN DIDOT, *A. Man. et l'hellénisme à Venise*, Paris, 1875; FROMMANN, *Aufsätze zur Geschichte des Buchhandels*, Jena, 1881, 11-51; GEIZER in the *Beil. zur Allgem. Zeitung*, 1881, No. 284; SCHÜCK, *Aldus Manutius*, 56 *seq.*, 68, 100 *seq.*; MÜHLBRECHT, *Bücherliebhaberei*, 31, 33 *seq.*; P. DE NOLHAC, *Correspond. de A. Man.*, in *Studi e doc.*, VIII., 247 *seq.*; cf. *Giorn. d. lett. Ital.*, XIII., 391 *seq.*; CASTELLANI, *La stampa in Venezia*, Venezia, 1889; F. ONGANIA, *L'Arti di stamp. nel rinasc. a Venezia*, Venezia, 1895; *Rev. d. Biblioth.*, VI., 143 *seq.*, 237 *seq.*, 311 *seq.*; FUMAGALLI, *Lexic. typogr. Ital.* ed. Milano, 1905.

† Cf. LEGRAND, *Bibliogr. hellénique*, I., cxvi., and 100 *seq.*

astical censures. On the other hand, Manutius is ordered to sell his editions at a reasonable and not extravagant price.\*

In order to promote Greek studies in Rome, Leo X. called thither in the first year of his reign the celebrated Giano Lascaris† and his scholar Marcus Musurus.‡ To the former, whose relations with Lorenzo the Magnificent had already been of the closest, was sent a letter composed by Sadoletto in terms of affection and intimacy.§ The letter to Musurus was written by Bembo, who informs him that the Pope earnestly longs to revive the well-nigh extinct knowledge of the language and literature of Greece, and generally to encourage the sciences as far as lies in his power. He is invited to bring ten or more young men of good abilities from Greece to Rome, in order that the Italians may learn the Greek language correctly from them. Further information concerning the proposed training college of science would be supplied by Lascaris.||

The new Greek College was opened in the house of the

\* ROSCOE-BOSSI, V., 301 *seq.* For the complaint brought by the Florentine printer Giunta against this privilege, and its dismissal by Leo, see MARZI, *Una questione libraria fra i Giunti ed Aldo Manuzio (Nozze Publ.)*, Firenze, 1895.

† The sources and the older literature relating to Giano Lascaris have been collected by MÜLLER in *Zentralbl. f. Bibliothekswesen*, I., 333 *seq.*; *cf.* 411 *seq.* about the defective work of VAST, *De Vita et operibus J. Lascaris*, Paris, 1878. The best information is in LEGRAND, *Bibliogr. hellénique*, I., cxxxi-clxii; II., 322-336. *Cf.* further, SCHÜCK, *Aldus*, 80, and *Mél. d'arch.*, 1886, 251 *seqq.*; *Rev. d. Biblioth.*, II., 280 *seqq.*, IV., 84 *seqq.*; FLAMINI, 96, 535; LUZIO, *Isabella d'Este*, 91.

‡ *Cf.*, with MENGE, *Hesychius*, rec. Schmidt, Jena, 1868; LEGRAND, I., cviii-cxxiv.

§ Sadoleti *Epist. Leonis X.*, 1759, 2-3.

|| BEMBI, *Epist.*, IV., 8; *cf.* VAST, 82 *seq.*

Colocci on the Quirinal ; \* Lascaris was Rector. He and Musurus, who came to Rome in 1516,† taught Greek ; Latin was assigned to Benedetto Lampridio of Cremona, who also posed as a poet.‡ A printing press was attached to the College, which received the name of the Medicean Academy, for the purpose of meeting the want of Greek books, then sensibly felt. Leo X. also founded a similar college in Florence, of which the Rector was Arsenio Apostolios.§

Lascaris stood high in favour with Leo X. ; || already, in February, 1514, he was named for the nunciature in Venice ; ¶ in October, 1515, he was entrusted with a weighty diplomatic mission to the King of France, who was sojourning in Upper Italy ; he was also, at a later date, admitted to the conferences on the Turkish war.\*\* In 1518 the great hellenist undertook a journey to France to give Francis I. the assistance of his counsels in that

\* LANCELOTTI, Colocci, 36. ; FOGLIAZZI, Raph. Brandolini, 128 ; and MARINI, Lettera, 70.

† Cf. Arch. Veneto, N. S., II., 1 (1901), 173-174.

‡ For Lampridio, see TIRABOSCHI, VII., 3, 197 *seqq.* ; RENAZZI, II., 13 *seq.* ; GNOLI, Un guidizio, 78 ; Giorn. de lett. Ital., XXXVI., 345 ; NOLHAC, 134 ; FLAMINI, 121.

§ LEGRAND, I., clxx. For the "Praeclara dicta," dedicated by Arsenio, Archbishop of Monembasia (cf. TIRABOSCHI, VII., 2, 395 *seqq.*), to Pope Leo X., see ROSCOE-BOSSI, IV., 116, 163 *seq.* The Laurentian Library possesses (Plut IV., Cod. XVI.) \*Arsenii Monembasiae Flores auctorum ad Leonem X.

|| He received a monthly pension : AMATI, 216, 226. The Pope also supported his family ; see Rev. d. Biblioth. V., 325-329.

¶ Cf. the \*letter of Cardinal Guilio de' Medici to Lorenzo, dated Rome, 1514, Feb. 20. State Archives, Florence, Av. il. princ., CXIII.

\*\* Cf. Vol. VII. of this work, 127, 222 n. MÜLLER (Zentralbl., *loc. cit.*, 412) is quite mistaken in putting the journey of Lascaris to France in 1515 ; Francis I. was then in Upper Italy.



monarch's endeavours to encourage the study of Greek.\* Lascaris continued to live in Rome† after the death of Leo, and died there about 1535. Over his grave in S. Agata alla Suburra may be read the pathetic epitaph: "Here rests Lascaris, among strangers, yet joyfully; for as a Greek he durst not hope for a single spot of free earth in his own fatherland."‡

The expectation of Musurus that, on the foundation of the Greek College, a second Athens would arise on Latin soil, was never fulfilled. The disappearance of this institution from history, it is with probability conjectured, was owing to the scarcity of money, by reason of which means were wanting to carry out the enterprise thus begun;§ the jealousy of the Roman men of learning may also have had a prejudicial influence;|| a harder blow was the death of Musurus, which took place in autumn 1517,¶ a year after his appointment by Leo to the Achbishopric of Monembasia (Napoli di Malvasia).\*\* His successor in this dignity was Manilio Rallo, another hellenist favoured by

\* LEGRAND, I., clii.; cf. VAST, 88 *seq.* See also TILLEY, Humanism under Francis I., in *Engl. Hist. Rev.*, XV. (1900), 456-478.

† That Lascaris settled in Paris after 1518 (MÜLLER, *loc. cit.*, 336), as GNOLI (Secolo, II., 634) also seems to suppose, is a mistake; LEGRAND, I., clii. *seq.*

‡ FORCELLA, X., 348.

§ Cf. GNOLI, Secolo, II., 636, who overlooks the fact that from the Greek College Leo's most noteworthy Greek scholars proceeded. For one of the most distinguished, Nik. Sophianos, see LEGRAND, I., clxxxvii. *seq.*

|| Cf. GNOLI, Un guidizio, 39.

¶ The statement that Musurus died of grief at being disappointed of a Cardinal's hat, is a fable; see LEGRAND, I., cxx.

\*\* Cf. ROSCOE-BOSSI, IV., 103 *seqq.*; LEGRAND, I., cxx. The latter quotes a \*Brief of Leo X., composed by Sadoletto, February 20, 1517 (in the National Library, Athens), from which it appears that Musurus held benefices from Leo in Crete and Cyprus.

Leo.\* Already, in the summer of 1514, Leo had nominated his own Greek teacher, Varino Favorino of Camerino, Bishop and Vice-Governor of Nocera.† As such he took part in the Lateran Council. Favorino's principal work, from the press of Zaccaria Calliergi, which made its appearance at last in 1523, was his famous Greek Lexicon. Before this, in 1517, he had dedicated to the Pope his Latin translation of a collection of Greek apothegms from various authors, by Giovanni Stobeo.‡ In the same year the Scholia on Homer were issued from the printing press belonging to the Greek College; from the same came also a new edition of Porphyry, and, for the first time, Commentaries on Sophocles. The copyright of these and other works produced by the same house was protected by Papal privileges which threatened with excommunication any contravention.§ The eagerness with which Leo supported the study of Oriental languages was also remarkable; his exertions in this direction were connected with the Lateran Council.||

\* The question, left unsettled by LEGRAND, I., clxvi., whether Rallo actually succeeded Musurus in this archbishopric, is now solved by the express statement of Sanuto, hitherto unnoticed (SANUTO, XXV., 64, 66; *cf.* 120, 502). Rallo is here named "servitor del Card. Medici."

† *Cf.* MESTICA, Varino Favorino, 38 *seq.*; MARINI, Lettera, 71 *seqq.*; ROSCOE-BOSSI, IV., 125 *seqq.*; KRUMBACHER, 577, and Bollett, p. l'Umbria, VII., 141 *seqq.* About the death of Favorino, *cf.* Atti e mem. d. deput. p. le prov. delle Marche, Nuovo Serie 2, I.

‡ MESTICA, 65 *seq.*, 69 *seqq.*; *cf.* LEGRAND, I., 175 *seq.*

§ Besides ROSCOE-BOSSI, IV., 110, *cf.* especially LEGRAND, I., 159, 162, 163, 164, 166, 169; *cf.* 129, 134, 153. Copies of the above-named books are very rare; the most complete collection is in the National Library, Paris.

|| See ROSCOE-BOSSI, IV., 140 *seqq.*; HAERKORN, Leo X., Der Mäcenat des christl. Rom., Dresden, 1872, 25 *seq.*; BURCKHARDT, I., 3rd ed., 244; GUBERNATIS, Matériaux p. servir à l'hist. d. études orient. en Italie, XXXV., 188, Paris, 1876. The first Ethiopian book

Brought up among books, Leo X., while Cardinal, had displayed great activity as a collector of manuscripts and printed works. He took a special delight in illuminated codices, a branch of art in which the Renaissance excelled.\* He shrank from no sacrifice in order to recover the valuable library of his family which the Florentines had confiscated in 1494, and the monks of San Marco had bought. This he succeeded in doing in 1508.† The library was now removed to Rome, and henceforward became the chief ornament of his palace at S. Eustachio (now the Palazzo Madama).‡ The charge of this precious collection, which was freely laid open to all men of learning,§ was entrusted to Varino Favorino.|| One of the first administrative acts of Leo X. was connected with his own library and that of the Vatican. The two collections were kept separate, the precise regulations bequeathed by Sixtus IV. for the maintenance and use of the literary treasures of the Vatican were re-enforced, and a new librarian was appointed.¶

Tommaso Inghirami, who had been nominated, in

that appeared in print was the Psalter, printed at Rome in 1513; Arch. d. Soc. Rom., IX., 273.

\* Cf. MÜNTZ, *Bibliothèque*, 37 *seqq.* A splendid example of the illuminative art of this period is afforded by the dedication copy of M. Salomoni's treatise *De Principatu*, now in the Vittorio Emanuele Library, Esp. n. 3.

† For the Medicean Library from 1494-1508, see Arch. Stor. Ital., 3rd Series, XIX., 101-129, 254-281; XXI., 102-112, 291-296. Cf. FABRONIUS, 265, and Mél. d'archéol., 1895, 475.

‡ ALBERTINI, *De Mirabil. Romae*, ed. Schmarsow, 35.

§ Access was even permitted when the Cardinal himself was there—an unprecedented permission. GNOLI, *Secolo*, II., 627.

|| MESTICA, Varino Favorino, 35 *seqq.*

¶ Regest. Leonis X., n. 4202. Cf. ASSEMANI, *Catal. Bibl. Vat.*, I., lxi., and MÜNTZ, *Bibl.* 23-24.

the first place, by Julius II., continued as Prefect of the Vatican Library, of which the arrangements were not altered.\* On account of his classical eloquence he was called the Cicero of his age, and played an important part at the Papal Court. The nickname of Fedra adhered to him, for, while yet a youth, he had taken the rôle of Phædra in a performance of the "Hippolytus" of Seneca, and during an accident to the stage machinery had improvised a set of Latin verses with great skill. He had now become a portly prelate; he is thus represented with startling fidelity to nature, in his red robes, pen in hand, and sunk in thought, in the celebrated picture in the Pitti Gallery, which has been attributed to Raphael.†

As Inghirami lost his life through an accident on the 5th of September, 1516,‡ Leo X., in grateful remembrance of the loyalty shown him during the time of his exile, bestowed this important and honourable post on the Bolognese humanist, Filippo Beroaldo, who, to distinguish him from his namesake and uncle, is spoken of as the younger.§ Beroaldo, who had been Cardinal Giovanni de' Medici's secretary, had already been distinguished by many marks of Papal favour. He was now not only custodian-in-chief of the treasures in the Pope's library, but also of the State Archives preserved in the Castle of St. Angelo.||

\* Cf. *Mél. d'archéol.*, 1895, 479.

† Cf. Vol. VI. of this work, 458, n.

‡ See *Giorn. d. lett. Ital.*, XXXIV., 8. For Inghirami, whom NOLHAC (*Erasme in Italie*, 68) calls "le type le plus accompli du Prélat Romain de la Renaissance," cf. Vol. VI. of this work, 458, n. See also MARINI, *Lettera*, 53 *seqq.*, and CIAN, *Cortegiano*, 204.

§ Besides the scholarly work of PAQUIER, *De Ph. Beroaldi, jun., vita et scriptis*, Parisiis, 1900, see also LUZIO-RENIER in *Giorn. d. lett. Ital.*, XXXVIII., 48 *seqq.*, and the literature there referred to.

|| Cf. ASSEMANI, I., lxi.; SADOLETI *epist.*, 195 *seqq.*; MÜNTZ, *Bibl.*, 29-31; PAQUIER, *Ph. Beroaldi Vita*, 15 *seqq.*



Beroaldo, highly gifted though he was, led an irregular and restless life and died early.\* He was succeeded in September, 1518, by the Pope's fellow-countryman, Zanobi Acciaiuoli. This learned Dominican, versed in the culture of humanism, devoted himself to his task with ardour. He not only drew up a new inventory of the library,† but also of the Archives of St. Angelo.‡

Acciaiuoli dying very soon,§ the learned Aleander took his place on July 27th, 1519, on the recommendation of Cardinal Medici;|| he filled his conspicuous position to the satisfaction of all scholars both in Italy and abroad.¶ The custodians of the library appointed by Julius II., Lorenzo Parmenio and Romulo Mammacino, retained their offices.\*\*

With regard to the loan of manuscripts, Leo X. was obliged to curtail the liberality of former days, as had indeed become necessary even under Julius II., this being the only way of preventing serious losses.†† In important cases, however, exceptions were permitted. In order that

\* Cf. SANUTO, XXVI., 19; PAQUIER, Vita, 21 *seqq.*, 28 *seqq.* Beroaldo was not a priest; see FANTUZZI, II., 140.

† \*Cod. Vatic., n. 3948, 3955, cf. n. 3950. See MÜNTZ, Bibl., 41 *seq.*, 50 *seq.*; DE ROSSI, Bibl. Apost. 43.

‡ First published by MONTFAUCON, Bibl. bibl., I., 202-215, and more correctly by ARETIN, Beiträge, II.<sup>a</sup>, 74 *seq.* Cf. BLUME, Iter, III., 24, and KEHR in the Nachr. der Gött. Ges. der Wiss., 1900, 115 *seq.* MARINI, Archivi d. S. Sede, 23, and BLUME, Iter, IV., 269 *seq.*, have called attention to the catalogue (still unpublished), made in 1516, of the Archives of the Apostolic Camera.

§ For Acciaiuoli, cf. *supra*, p. 214, and especially MAZZUCHELLI, I., I., 50 *seq.*\* See also MARINI, Lettera, 69 *seq.*, 113.

|| See ASSEMANI, I., lxii.; Rev. d. biblioth., II., 49 *seq.*, 68; SADOLETI epist., 197 *seqq.*

¶ Cf. ZIEGLER'S testimony in Giorn. d. lett. Ital., IX., 451, n. 5.

\*\* MÜNTZ, Bibl., 31. Cf. Giorn. d. lett. Ital., IX., 452.

†† MÜNTZ, Bibl., 39 *seq.* Cf. Giorn. d. lett. Ital., IX., 452.

Cardinal Ximenes might be helped in the completion of his famous Complutensian Polyglot, the Pope gave orders that the requisite Greek manuscripts should be sent from the Vatican Library to Spain, even if they had to be secured with chains of iron.\*

Leo X. was no less zealous than his predecessors in adding to the treasures of books and manuscripts in the Papal collection. It recalls the days of Nicholas V., when we consider how the Pope had his emissaries in all quarters, from Scandinavia to the East, in search of the monuments of literature. Among many others entrusted with these behests were Agostino Beazzano, Angelo Arcimboldi, Fausto Sabeo, Johann Heitmers, and Francesco de Rosis.† In a letter to the last named, Leo explains directly that he considers it one of his most urgent duties to increase the number of copies of ancient authors in order that, under his pontificate, latinity may flourish once more.‡

The Pope's personal interest in these literary missions is clearly shown in the letters to ecclesiastical and secular princes in Germany, Denmark, Sweden, Norway, and Gothland, with which Johann Heitmers, the ecclesiastic of Liège,

\* Regest. Leonis X., n. 4263. The \*Licentia, dated 1513, August 19, issued to Alphonso Garciae abbati de Compludo, to borrow Greek MSS. from the Vatican Library, here wanting, is in Cod. Barb., lat. 2428 *seq.*, 116, of the Vatican Library. Cf. FABRONIUS, 307, and HEFELE, Ximenes, 2nd ed., Tübingen, 1851, 117. See also PRESCOTT, Ferdinand the Catholic, II., 486, 514. One of the very rare copies of the Complutensian Polyglot on parchment belongs to the Vatican Library.

† See ROSCOE-BOSSI, IV., 137 *seq.*, 145, *cf.* X., 92-97; BLUME, III., 34; GREGOROVIVS, VIII., 292. For Fausto Sabeo, whose epigram (Epigr. Romae, 1556, 402; *cf.* RENAZZI, II., 12 *seq.*) shows that here also the precarious state of finances stood in the way, *cf.* QUIRINI, Spec. Litt. in Brixia, II., 167, and ROSCOE-BOSSI, X., 14 *seqq.*, 92 *seqq.*

‡ Cf. *supra*, p. 195.

was furnished on the occasion of his mission in 1517.\* "From the beginning of our pontificate," it here runs, "we have, by the help of God, and for His honour and glory, spared neither pains nor money to discover valuable treasures of ancient literature, for the profit as well as the honour of virtuous and especially of learned men." Heitmers was either to borrow such works, under guarantees from the Apostolic Chamber, for purposes of copying, or, as the Pope greatly preferred, to purchase the originals. In Heitmers' letters of introduction,† Leo laid the greatest stress on his intention so to advance the reviving knowledge of ancient literature, that the most remarkable productions of antiquity should be preserved and their number increased, both in the present time and for the time to come; at the same time he emphasized his plans for making the newly-acquired classics of Greece and Rome generally accessible by means of printing. With this end in view a general investigation was to be made of the

\* Of these letters, three by Sadoletto have been printed, namely: (a) to King Christian of Denmark, dated November 8, 1517, first published in *Nova Litt. maris Balthici*, IV., Lubecae, 1697, 347; then by ROSCOE-BOSSI X., 249-250 (instead of 1518, read 1517); (b) to Archbishop Albert of Mayence, dated November 26, 1517; (c) to an anonymous (awaiting identification; cf. *Philologus*, XLV., 377 *seqq.*) owner of all the decades of Livy, dated December 1, 1517. These two letters, first by BAYLE, *Dict.*, art. Léon X.; then by SCHMIDT, *Einleitung zur brandenburg, Kirchen und Ref.-Historie*, Berlin, 1740, 244 *seq.*, 246 *seq.*, and ROSCOE-BOSSI, X., 245-249; that to Albert, also by MÜNTZ, *Bibl.*, 35-37, and SCHULTE, II., 188-189. The letter of December 1, 1517 (with the address to Albert of Mayence, also in *Anz. für Kunde deutsch. Vorzeit*, 1863, No. 10), is questioned, without grounds, by F. RITTER (*Philologus*, XVII., 665); see URLICH, *Eos*, I. (1864), 244, and SCHANZ, *Gesch. der röm. Lit.*, II., 2nd ed. (1901), 249; see also WEIDLUNG, *Schwedische Reformationsgeschichte*, 65.

† This hitherto unknown document is taken from an MS. in the Wolfenbüttel Library, in Appendix, No. 8.

libraries of Germany and Scandinavia. Privileges and special favours would be held out to the owners; those who opposed the scheme were threatened with the greater excommunication. Heitmers had also authority to appoint assistant commissioners. The first point of capital importance was to find a perfect copy of the History of Livy, a search which Nicholas V. had promoted with eagerness. Heitmers had boasted of his knowledge of the existence of such a manuscript, and Leo had promised him a large reward for the discovery. Fresh hope of a successful issue of his mission was encouraged by the circumstance that Leo X. had come into possession of a manuscript of the first six books of the Annals of Tacitus,\* which had already been printed and published in 1515 by Filippo Beroaldo. This manuscript of Tacitus belonged originally to the monastery of Corvey, whence it was abstracted. In his passion for promoting classical studies, Leo had so few scruples with regard to this method of procuring his spoils, that in one of the letters entrusted to Heitmers, he speaks quite openly of the abstraction of the manuscript, which had passed through many hands, and had, at length, come into his possession, and adds for the Abbot's consolation: "We have sent a copy of the revised and printed books in a beautiful binding to the Abbot and his monks, that they may place it in their library as a substitute for the one taken from it. But in order that they may understand that this purloining has done them far more good than harm, we have granted them for their Church a plenary indulgence."†

\* Now in the Laurent. Library, Plut., XLVIII., 1; cf. BANDINIUS, II., 831 *seqq.*; PAQUIER, Vita Beroaldi, 59 *seqq.*, where see the special authorities. We may add: Philologus, XLV., 376 *seqq.*; Eos, I., 243, III., 223; and HÜFFER, Corveier Studien, Münster, 1898.

† Leo's attempt to obtain manuscripts from Melk was unsuccessful



At the end of Beroaldo's edition of Tacitus\* we see the Pope's arms, and under them the words: "In the name of Leo X. great rewards are promised to those who send him ancient writings which have not yet been made known." The edition also contains a Papal privilege against unauthorized impressions of the work. In this Leo justifies, in eloquent language, the warmth with which he pursues the advancement of heathen literature: "Since God called us to the high dignity of the Pontificate we have devoted ourselves to the government and extension of the Church, and, among other objects, we have conceived it to be our duty to foster especially literature and the fine arts: for, from our earliest youth we have been thoroughly convinced that, next to the knowledge and true worship of the Creator, nothing is better or more useful for mankind than such studies, which are not only an adornment and a standard of human life, but are also of service in every circumstance; in misfortune they console us, in prosperity they confer joy and honour, and without them man would be robbed of all social grace and culture. The security and the extension of these studies seem to demand two conditions: on the one hand, they require a sufficient number of learned and scholarly men, and, on the other, an unlimited supply of first-rate books. With regard to the first, we hope, through God's help, to have already made it evident that it is our warmest desire and firm determination to honour and reward their deserts,

(see KEIBLINGER, I., 718); from Monte Cassino, on the other hand, he acquired some codices (see EHRHARD in the *Hist. Polit. Bl.*, CV., 641 *seq.*).

\* Although printed in 1515 in Rome, there no longer exists a copy of this edition in the city; on this *cf.*, besides MORENI, *S. Lorenzo*, I., 259, also PAQUIER, *Vita Beroaldi*, 32 *seq.* The National Library, Paris, possesses a remarkably fine copy.

which has indeed ever been our greatest joy. As regards the acquisition of books, we give God thanks that in the present instance we have a further opportunity of rendering useful service to our fellow-men." \*

Certainly no Pope had given stronger marks of his appreciation of the importance of the ancient classics. But while fully recognizing Leo's enthusiasm for the authors of antiquity, it ought not to be passed over in silence that his interest in them was sometimes carried too far, as, for example, when he accepted the dedication of the first edition of a poem by Rutilius Namatianus, unconcerned by the circumstance that this fervent worshipper of the gods described the teaching of the Christian Church as worse than the poison of Circe, in so far as the latter only transformed the bodies, but the former the minds of men.† Nor was it without significance also that Reuchlin in 1517 ventured to dedicate his "Kabbala" to Leo X. Certainly, two years later, Hochstraten was able to publish his "Destruction of the Kabbala," with a dedication to the same Pontiff.‡ In fact, the number of writings dedicated to Leo was so great that a complete enumeration of them is impossible in the space at our disposal.§

\* The letter, of which ROSCOE-HENKE, II., 157 *seq.*, gives a translation, was written by Sadoletto. Hutten saw in Leo's reservation of the right of printing a sign of envy of the intellectual culture of the German people! Cf. STRAUSS, II., 36.

† See ITACIUS LEMNIACUS, Des Claudius Rutilius Namatianus Heimkehr., Berlin, 1872, 25, 31. Cf. Cl. Rutilius Namatianus, édit. crit. p. Vessereau, Paris, 1904.

‡ GEIGER, 199 *seq.*, 237 *seq.*; PAULUS, Dominkaner, 98. Hutten's dedication of Valla's writing on the donation of Constantine was naturally pure scorn, which, as it would seem, Leo ignored; STRAUSS, II., 70.

§ Besides the instances already mentioned, I confine myself to the following indications: BANDINIUS, Cat. Cod. Bibl. Laurent, I., 725

In spite of the Pope's extraordinary efforts, the additions to the Vatican Library were not so large as might have been expected. From the inventories we find that the total number of volumes did not exceed 4070 as against 3650 under Sixtus IV. The golden age for the acquirement of new manuscripts was over; the competition of the printers proved an obstacle.\* Moreover, the low state of the Papal finances must have acted detrimentally. Without doubt such was the case with respect to the Roman University;† Leo certainly showed

*seqq.*, II., 31 *seqq.*, 139 *seqq.*; FANTUZZI, II., 226; MAZZUCHELLI, I., 50, 380; GIULIARI, Lett. Veron., 148, 242; MAZZATINTI, IV., 203; BUDIK, III., 2; *Civiltà Catt.*, 1899, I., 407; *Der Katholik*, 1900, II., 477. Numerous manuscripts besides, in the Vatican Library, must be taken into account. We may mention Cod. Vat., \*3447, Christoph. Marcelli *Dialogus de animae sanitate ad Leonem X.*; \*3646, Christoph. Marcelli *oratio ad Leonem X.*; \*3726, Franc. Syragatti *de ortu et occasu siderum libri. duo ad Leonem X.*; \*3732, Joannis Poggii Florentini *de veri pastoris munere ad Leonem X.*; \*3745, Constantii Felicis de Castro Durantii *historia de conjuratione Catilinae with praefatio ad Leonem X.*; \*3844, Sebastiani Compagni Ferrarriens. *Geographia ad Leonem X.*; \*5794, Petri Martyris *Navigat. Indicae ad Leonem X.* For the very numerous dedications likewise to Cardinal Medici, see Vol. X. of this work.

\* Cf. MÜNTZ, *Bibl.*, 43, and *Giorn. d. lett. Ital.*, IX., 453.

† The Pope did not confine his interest to the Roman University. The Universities also of Bologna, Pisa (*cf.* Raph. Volaterr.,\* *Brevis histor. in Cod. Vat.*, 5875, f. 44 [Vatican Library], and IOANNINENSIS, *Pentatheucus*, f. 102b), Avignon, Louvain, Frankfurt, Ingolstadt, Cracow, and Vienna were generously dealt with. Cf. *Regest. Leonis X.*, n. 5466, 5686, 6794, 7037, 7555, 4557, 4558, 6086, 1898, 1899, 4629, 3589. In a \*Brief dated January 4, 1515, Leo X. confirmed the measures taken by Cardinal Antonio del Monte, Legate in Perugia, by an \*edict of October 25, 1514, for the support of the "Studio" in that city. Both documents are in the Communal Library, Perugia. It was not previously known that Leo also supported the Florentine Academy. In the \*Introit. et Exit., 558, f. 213, there is the following entry under

no lack of zeal in his endeavours to prop up this institution. A new era seemed to open before it when, on the 5th of November, 1513, a Papal Constitution was published enjoining several wholesome reforms.\* The principal of these consisted in a re-enactment of the regulations of Eugenius IV.; important privileges and adequate revenues were to ensure the prosperity of the University. With regard to the professors, it was prescribed that they should devote themselves exclusively to their professional duties and deliver their lectures punctually; in addition to the latter, they were from time to time to give oral instruction to their pupils on the subjects treated in their courses; thus a sort of seminary was formed, perhaps the first of its kind known in the history of universities. On the 20th of September, 1514, Leo X. sanctioned the erection of a private chapel in the University buildings and the foundation of a Provostship with two chaplains under the patronage of the Medici; in the chapel, moreover, were to be held the academic ceremonies, such as the conferring of doctors' degrees, public disputations, and other functions.† The teaching strength of the University was extended by invitations to scholars outside. The most distinguished among the teachers secured by the

January 30, 1519: \*Dicta die solvit duc. 75 similes de mand. sub die 29 Maii preteriti dom. Antonio Dolphino Benintendi, praesidenti Academie Florentin., pro pensione domus conducte pro exercitio scientie academice per menses decem et octo finitos die 22 Martii preteriti. Secret Archives of the Vatican.

\* The Constitution *Dum suavissimos* is given in a mutilated and inaccurate form in Bull. V., 568, correctly in the Regest. Leonis X., n. 5265. Cf. RENAZZI, II., 25 seq.; RATTI, Lettera, 14; and MORPURGO, Roma e la Sapienza, Roma, 1881, 23.

† The Provost was Fil. Beroaldo, the Chaplains were Camillo Porzio (see *supra*, p. 227) and Giov. Gazoldo (see *supra*, p. 153 n.); Regest. Leonis X., n. 11,820. Cf. MARINI, Lettera, 44 seqq.; FANTAZZI, II., 137 seqq.



Pope were the philosopher Agostino Nifo, the doctor of medicine Christoforo Aretino, the jurist Girolamo Botticella, and the humanists Giampaolo Parisio and Basilio Calcondila, the first of whom was Professor of Rhetoric and the second of Greek. A special chair of Hebrew was also erected.\* If the professors whom he invited were otherwise under engagements, Leo endeavoured in "the public interest" to free them, since the Roman University, as far as possible, was to have the most illustrious staff of teachers.†

A highly-interesting glimpse of the position of higher education at the beginning of Leo's reign is afforded by an official register of professors belonging to the year 1514.‡ The number of names does not fall short of eighty-eight. Almost all divisions were under more than one professor. Philosophy and Theology number seventeen, Canon Law eleven, Civil Law twenty, Medicine fifteen, Rhetoric eighteen,§ Greek three, Mathematics two, Astrology and Botany have one each.|| The salaries of the professors vary

\* Cf. RENAZZI, II., 77-78. For Nifo, see *supra*, p. 250; for G. Parisio (Aulus Janus Parrhasius), see JANNELLI, Vita Auli Jani Parrhasii, Neapoli, 1844; AMATI, 229; F. LO PARCO, A. G. Parrasio, Vasto, 1899; Giorn. d. lett. Ital., XXV., 132 *seq.* Leo X. also wished to attach Filippo Decio to his University; see RENAZZI, II., 32.

† See Appendix, No. 2, the \*Brief to Bologna of Feb. 19, 1514. State Archives, Bologna.

‡ Published with explanatory notes in the rare pamphlet, Lettera dell' Abb., G. Marini al ch. Mons. G. Muti Papazurri già Casali, Roma, 1797. Cf. also RENAZZI, II., 33 *seq.*, 38 *seq.* For the Professor of Greek, Agostino Valdo, see Rev. d. Biblioth., V., 14 *seq.*

§ See La Retorica corrispondeva in qualche modo alla Facoltà di lettere. GNOLI, Pasquino, 62.

|| The chair of botany in Rome was the first founded in Italy; see MARINI, Lettera, 75 *seq.*, *ibid.*, 45, for Leo's fondness for astrology. Cf. MARZI, 36 *seq.*, "Lucha stoligho del Papa" is mentioned in the Censimento, 81, published by Armellini.

from 50 to 530 gold florins ; the highest, 530 and 500 gold florins, were paid to the doctors of medicine, Arcangelo of Siena and Scipione de' Lancelloti. The famous Paolo Giovio received, as Professor of Ethics, 130; the jurist, Mario Salomoni, 150; the philosopher, Agostino Nifo, 300; the master of perspective, Luca Paciolo di Borgo San Sepolcro, a Minorite, 120 gold florins. Of the humanists, Inghirami and the Greek professors each received 300 gold florins at the utmost; Beroaldo and Raffaello Brandolini Lippi had 250, Parisio 200, Camillo Porzio 150 gold florins. The total expenditure for professors' salaries amounted in 1514 to 14,490 gold florins. The Pope was not backward in making sacrifices for his darling scheme,\* and his hope that the Roman University might become the first in Italy does not seem to have been groundless. Nevertheless his great aim was not realized; different circumstances worked together to bring this about. In the first place, death caused vacancies which could not be filled up; soon after the compilation of the register just mentioned Calcondila and Botticella died, Inghirami followed in 1516 and Beroaldo in 1518. Even more serious than these losses was the rivalry of Pisa, whither Nifo, Christoforo Aretino, and the jurists Giambattista Ferreri and Pier Paolo Parisi betook themselves.† The cause of their defection was probably, in the first place, the Pope's financial difficulties, which disastrously affected the position of the University, as they did, indeed, all his undertakings. Besides, many secured chairs by favour and not by merit, in consequence of the widespread encroachments of patronage;‡ others sought to oust rivals from their chairs by intrigue §

\* Cf. BROSCH, I., 332.

† GNOLI, Secolo, II., 634.

‡ Cf. BROSCH, *loc. cit.*

§ As in the case of Matteo Ercolano, although he had written an

At the time of Leo's death things had come to such a pass that a Professor of Jurisprudence could write: "There is a crowd of professors who have been appointed without selection: the salaries are not sufficient to live upon, and, worst of all, are paid so irregularly that it costs more trouble to raise the money than to give a whole course of instruction."\* Leo's personal interest in the University,† undeniably great as it was, could not avert the approaching downfall. It was, moreover, unfortunate that this state of things almost coincided with a decline of literary pursuits in the Roman Curia.‡

The fate of the University may be looked upon as typical of the literary age of which Leo X. was the Mæcenæ; a fair beginning, awakening wide expectations, most of which were doomed to grievous disappointment. The critical observer encounters this picture more or less distinctly at every step. The causes why such comparatively small results were obtained are to be found, on the one hand, in the calamitous state of the finances, and, on the other, in the often irresponsible way in which Leo X. distributed his too open-handed patronage and support.

"Encomium in laudem Leonis X." (see FANTUZZI, III., 275, and *supra*, p. 227). M. Ercolano, who taught classics in the University after the death of Brandolini Lippi, swore to the Pope in a letter, \*that he would not deprive the former of his chair, although some wished him to do so. He wrote, among other things: \*ad te vero pertinet ne tua decreta resolvens a teque ipse dissentiens et plus quam par sit aliorum voluntatibus permittens in numerum cogi judiceris. I found this undated letter in Cod. Regin., 2023, f. 196-199, Vatican Library.

\* GNOLI, *Secolo*, II., 637 *seqq.*; regarding the appointment of unfit persons, he recalls Gazoldo (see *supra*, p. 153 n.), Giulio Simone, and Querno (see *supra*, p. 153).

† Cf. SANUTO, XXVI., 195.

‡ See DENIFLE, *Universitäten*, I., 315. MORPURGO (*loc. cit.*, 24) erroneously ascribes the fall of the Roman University to Adrian VI.

At the first glance we are dazzled by Leo's attitude towards knowledge and literature, so many famous names are linked with his memory, and the chorus of praise from his contemporaries is so overpowering. The verdict of posterity has, in the main, been most largely influenced by the famous biography of Giovio; in it the able Medici Pope is depicted in strong contrast to the warlike Julius II., and the name of Leo is given as the watchword of the golden age which he inaugurated.\*

Henceforth he is its Mæcenās, surrounded by a halo so brilliant that it has cast a glamour over the eyes even of the keen and bitter enemies of Rome.† It is only after a closer review of details and a critical inquiry into actual facts that another picture is evolved, less flattering, but more in agreement with the truth. The splendour of the University, with its staff of eighty-eight professors, as well

\* The titles to fame, which Giovio adduces for the literary patronage of his hero in the third Book of his *Vita*, are: (1) The appointments of Bembo and Sadoleto as Papal secretaries. (2) The appointment of Beroaldo to the librarianship of the Vatican. (3) The call of distinguished professors to the Roman University: "Gymnasium vero accitis undique gravissimarum artium professoribus ita instauravit, ut neque Bononiensi neque Patavino vel doctorum praestantia vel auditorum concursu concedere videretur." (4) The patronage of poets: "Singulos vero vel mediocris etiam nominis poetas et exquisitis nobilibusque artibus instructos tanta benignitate suscipiebat ut omnes jam excitatis animis ad excolenda literarum studia vehementer accenderentur, *quum ab tanto armorum strepitu, quo neglectis literis Julii aures magnopere gaudebant, tandem virtuti locus patefactus esse videretur.* . . . Florebat enim tum Roma praestantibus ingeniis copia incredibiliter rerum omnium et a clementiore coelo inusitata aëris salubritate, ita ut Leo tantae virtutis ac amplitudinis pontifex, auream aetatem post multa saecula condidisse diceretur."

† Cf. DÖLLINGER's judgment, *Vorträge*, II., Nördlingen, 1889, 194-195.



as that of the Greek College, loses somewhat of its lustre, and the mental and intellectual worth of the whole swarm of poets and poetasters shrivels up into its true significance. The support which Leo X. gave to men of letters and to scholars turns out, on nearer scrutiny, to have been only too often misapplied, and, moreover, to have been narrower in its scope than contemporary and later panegyrists have represented it to be. The direct results of the literary influence of Leo X. were, despite the high-pitched encomiums of his admirers, practically insignificant. There is more legend than truth in the view, so often presented, in which he presides over an era of literary progress and productiveness.\* He has usurped the right to give his name to an epoch of which the foundations had been laid and the ways opened by his predecessors.†

\* Of recent writers, besides GNOLI (51 *seqq.*), CIAN especially has insisted on this; see *Giorn. stor. d. lett. Ital.*, XXIX., 439; XXXVI., 215. How exaggerated former estimates were, *cf.* BUDIK, I., xxxiv. *seq.*

† *Cf.* GNOLI, *Secolo*, II., 629 *seq.* For Julius II.'s services to the literature of the Renaissance, see Vol. VI. of this work, 457 *seq.*, 459 *seq.* The first, who quite arbitrarily extended the Leonine epoch from 1500 to 1550, was ORELLI (*Beiträge zur Geschichte d. ital. Poesie*, Heft 2, Zürich, 1810, 98); he was followed by SCHLÜTER (*M. A. Flaminius und seine Freunde. Dichterproben aus dem Zeitalter Leos X.*, Mainz, 1847). Leo X. as patron of letters is celebrated in an exaggerated and uncritical way by ROSCOE, whose life of Leo the Tenth appeared in Liverpool in 1805 (in German first by Von Henke, Leipzig, 1806; in Italian, with many valuable additions, by Bossi, Milano, 1816-17). RENAZZI (II., 1 *seqq.*, 15 *seqq.*); RATTI (*Lettera al sig. C. Fea sul di lui parallelo di Giulio II. con Leon X.*, Roma, 1822); HAFERKORN (*Leo X., Der Mäcenat des christlichen Rom*, Dresden, 1872) as well as AUDIN (*Hist. de Léon X. et de son siècle*, Paris, 1852) and BIECHY (*Tableau du siècle de Léon X.*, Limoges, 1844) in their utterly worthless panegyrics, while ANDRES and DANDOLO are devoid of any literary merit; others, as CANTÙ and

He cannot be considered the leader of an age of which he was in every particular the offspring, swayed hither and thither by its most varying tendencies, by the noble and the ignoble, by the lofty and the base.\* The unique reputation which his partisans have conferred upon him must give way before the sober verdict of critical examination; his actual services, which cannot be denied, fall far short of his renown.

The love of science and literature which inspired the son of Lorenzo the Magnificent often took the form of literary dilettantism.† Like most of his contemporaries, he overvalued in a remarkable way the poets of that day, whose compositions were as often as not distinguished only by elegance of style. In his quick enthusiasm he was much too easily satisfied. It was sufficient for him if a letter, a speech, or a poem was gracefully turned; he very often overlooked the contents for the form. In the distribution of his favours he had by no means a happy hand; he lavished his rewards without method and without discrimination. He took equal pleasure in real poets, improvisatori, and the class of persons who cannot be included among the men of letters, but can only find a

REICHENSPERGER (*Fingerzeige*, 4 *seq.*), see only paganism in Leo, against which view CIAN rightly protests (*Giorn. d. lett. Ital.*, XXIX., 404). Much more moderate and sounder are the later judgments of Burckhardt, Reumont and Gregorovius. JANSSEN (II., 18th ed., 67), and more strongly still GNOLI (*Secolo di Leon X.*, 1897-98), turns the reverse side of the medal. In agreement with the latter, yet with reservations, is KRAUS (*Medicean Rome in The Cambridge Modern History*, II., Cambridge, 1904, 11 *seqq.*, 15 *seqq.*). MASI (142 *seq.*) tries to take a middle course, but does not go sufficiently into detail. G. CONFORTI (*Leon X. ed il suo Secolo*, Torino, 1896) is without value.

\* REUMONT, III., 2, 335.

† Cf. GNOLI, *Secolo*, III., 39.

place among jesters and entertainers.\* He too often took everything merely as a pastime or theatrical representation;† the patron of a Baraballo and a Fra Mariano was wanting in seriousness and force of character, as well as in taste and judgment.

The splendour of the Leonine age, so often and so much belauded, is in many respects more apparent than real. Like a brilliant display of fireworks, it leaves nothing more behind it than the recollection. Not only in the sphere of pure science do we look in vain for really great works; even in that of polite literature the conventional tributes of praise must be largely discounted.‡ There is nothing really of first-rate excellence except the poems of Vida and Sannazaro. Leo's importance is limited to this, that he was before all else a stimulating force; in this respect he undoubtedly rendered manifold services. We must not depreciate the general impulse which he gave to artistic as also to literary and scientific life. It was his work to create in Rome an intellectual atmosphere, a "milieu" without which even Raphael would not have reached such ripe maturity. To him also it was due, to a great extent, that humanism spread its influence over such an appreciably large portion of Europe.§ This was of no small import-

\* BURCKHARDT'S quick perception has drawn attention, in a passage which has generally been overlooked (I., 3rd ed., 232), to the capriciousness of Leo's patronage, which was somewhat of a lottery.

† GNOLI, *Secolo*, III., 40.

‡ GNOLI, *Secolo*, III., 52 *seqq.*

§ MASI has recently called attention to this (I., 211) strongly. BURCKHARDT long before had already given his opinion (*Kultur der Renaissance*, I., 3rd ed., 266): "What the humanists have effected in Europe since 1520 or thereabouts, has been conditioned entirely by the impulse given to them by Leo." GEIGER speaks in the same sense in the *Zeitschr. f. Renaissance, Lit.* I., 147, of "the permanent place which Leo has won for himself in the history of the human mind."

ance in the history of the development of Western civilization; the Renaissance literature of Italy pointed out the way to the Romance nations, in which, by a felicitous combination of antique and national elements, they should produce works of classical perfection.\* Not less important was the advance made in the knowledge and appreciation of antiquity.† All this was more or less affected by the favour and encouragement given by Leo X. to the Renaissance of literature. Therefore, undoubtedly a certain share in the renown of the Papacy, as one of the foremost educators of the world, belongs to the son of Lorenzo the Magnificent. Much more must history greet his name with honour and gratitude when she reflects on the protection given to art by the first Pope of the House of Medici.

\* BAUMGARTNER, IV., 637.

† Cf. JOLY, Sadolet, 64 *seqq.*



## CHAPTER VII.

### LEO X. AS THE PATRON OF THE ARTS.—THE STANZE, TAPESTRIES AND LOGGIE OF RAPHAEL.

AMONG the artistic creations which owed their existence to the Medici Pope, works of painting hold the first rank in point of number, as well as on account of their intrinsic value and of the subjects they portray. Among these the wonderful achievements of Raphael are pre-eminent.

With the reign of Leo X. a new epoch in the artistic career of this master begins. Heavy and varied as the tasks might be with which the Pope plied him, the lovable and gifted painter of Urbino knew how to adapt his great talents to demands which multiplied almost in excess of human capacity. Wondrous was the devotion with which, up to the hour of his early death, he gave himself to the work he had to do; astonishing was his zeal for study, his inexhaustible productiveness, the unflagging advance of his artistic power. Besides the obvious task of finishing the monumental frescoes in the Stanze, Leo X., in the first year of his pontificate, laid upon him simultaneously a second task not less difficult and extensive than the first, namely, the cartoons for the tapestries of the Sixtine Chapel. Along with these undertakings, each of which by itself was of a nature to exhaust all the artist's resources, there were yet many other commissions of greater or less importance to execute at the instance of the Pope and his

artistic circle. Raphael, whose creative genius delighted in exerting all its powers to meet these increasing demands, found himself, in a proportionate degree, forced to call in his pupils to his aid. Vasari and the historians of art who have followed him have greatly exaggerated their number. There were at first only two painters who stood on a level with their master, Giovanni Francesco Penni and Giulio Romano. On those two favourites, who alone are entitled to be called his disciples in the fullest sense of the word, Raphael bestowed a life-long affection and trust.\*

Traces of other hands are already discernible in the fresco of the Meeting of Attila and Leo the Great,† in the Stanza d'Eliodoro, the completion of which was interrupted by the illness and death of Julius II. The composition and drawing, as well as the colouring of this picture, disclose defects incompatible with the master-touch of Raphael.‡ The landscape with ruins of Rome bears all the characteristics of Giovanni Francesco Penni; Giovanni da Udine, to whom it was formerly attributed, is out of the question.§ In this fresco a marked alteration was made in the figure of Leo I.; in Raphael's original sketch, this great Pope appears with the features of Julius II.; the warlike Rovere, recognizable by his long beard, is here carried in his litter, wearing an expression of perfect tranquillity, to meet the savage and boisterous Hunnish king and his troop of horsemen, while the princes of the Apostles, Peter and Paul, sweep down from heaven with threaten-

\* DOLLMAYR, 231-237.

† Cf. WICKHOFF'S Review of Pastor's "Leo X." in the *Kunstgeschichtl. Anzeigen*, 1906, 54.

‡ Cf. WÖLFFLIN, 104 *seq.*

§ DOLLMAYR, 231 *seq.*, 237.

ing gestures.\* The fresco as we now see it shows, in place of Julius II., his beardless successor Leo X., clothed in full pontifical vestments and mounted on the white charger which carried him in the battle of Ravenna, and, a year later, in the magnificent procession on his way to take possession of the Lateran.† There is no doubt that the artist effected this metamorphosis at the special wish of the new Pope, who sought thus to hand down to posterity an enduring portrait of himself and a memorial, as well, of his deliverance from French captivity.‡ Two inscriptions on the window beneath the Deliverance of St. Peter attest that the works in the Stanza d'Eliodoro were finished in the summer of 1514.§

The order to decorate the third Stanza followed without delay, for on the 1st of July, 1514, Raphael informed his uncle, Simone Ciarla, that he had begun to paint another hall for His Holiness, for which he was to receive one thousand two hundred gold ducats.|| In the following year he sent to Dürer at Nuremburg, in order "to show his hand" to the German master, the red crayon sketch, now preserved at Vienna, of two figures in the sea-fight at Ostia. Not until June, 1517, was the painting of this hall completed; so states

\* KLACZKO, Jules II., 392, 407. Cf. CROWE-CAVALCASELLE, II., 152.

† Beside the Pope stands his Master of the Ceremonies. Thus we have here a portrait of Paris de Grassis.

‡ The last seems probable from the poem of Giraldi. That the deliverance of Peter refers to Julius II. and not to Leo X., I have shown in Vol. VI. of this work, p. 605. STEINMANN is of the same opinion in the Zeitschr. für bild. Kunst., N. F., X., 177.

§ Leo X. Pont. || Max. || Ann. Christ || MDXIII. || Pontificat. Sui II. The second year of his Pontificate dates from March 19, 1514, to March 19, 1515. That the work was finished in the summer, appears from the letter quoted *infra*, p. 284 n., and from the balance-sheet of August 1, 1514, in FEA, Notizie, 9.

|| PUNGILEONI, 157; GUHL, I., 93 *seq.*

the Ferrarese Envoy,\* and the inscription on the window is in agreement with this.† The extraordinary delay in the completion of the third Stanza is explained by Raphael's nomination as architect of St. Peter's as early as 1514.‡ This additional burden was made all the heavier by the ardour with which Raphael applied himself to it. His absorption in architectural matters led him to a thorough study of the antique, the influence of which is to be seen clearly in the frescoes of the third Stanza.§ But, on the other hand, the imperative claims of the new undertaking—the building of St. Peter's—forced him to allow his pupils, to a much larger extent, a free hand with his pictures, and to enlarge continually the scope of their co-operation. A merely superficial inspection of the frescoes in the third Stanza shows that not one of them is the work of Raphael's hand alone; more recent investigation has proved that even in their composition Raphael's influence has become, to some extent, subordinate.

The idea of the fresco decoration in the third Stanza is closely connected with that in the Stanza d'Eliodoro: here also the greatness and power of the Papacy, as the central point of the Church, is to be celebrated with reference to the actual sovereignty of the exalted patron of the work. The purely personal references to the reigning Pontiff, which, only lightly touched on in the first Stanza, are brought out much more clearly in the second, receive

\* The letter of the Envoy in *Gaz. des Beaux-Arts*, 1863, I, 351, and *Atti Mod.*, I., 115. Cf. Bembo's letter to Bibbiena of July 19, 1517, *Opere* III., 14.

† Leo X. Pont. Max. || Anno Christ. || MCCCCXVII. || Pontificatus || Sui Anno || IIII.

‡ See *infra*, p. 362 *seq.*

§ See STRZYGOWSKI, 56 *seq.*



in the third so strong an emphasis that the continuity of subject runs a risk of being broken; and the intention thus intrusively forced on the notice of the beholder has a disturbing effect. The idea of restoring a combination with the subjects on the ceiling, where the Christ in Glory, painted by Perugino for Julius II., retained its place, was abandoned: the great frescoes on the walls tell their own story, but the only link which holds them together is the name of Leo. The fitting designation for the chamber would thus be "the Leonine Hall."\* From the respective histories of Leo III. and Leo IV., whom the Church has raised to her altars, two important incidents have been chosen which, besides suggesting the identity of the Papal names, were at the same time capable of application to events in the glorious present. And, as if something still were wanting, Leo III. and Leo IV. are invariably portrayed with the uncomely features of the Medici Pope. In thus displaying pictures which were mere offerings of homage to Leo X., the fact was overlooked that paintings of this sort produce only a disagreeable and chilling impression. One can well conceive that Raphael took little pleasure in a task so uncongenial to the natural bent of his genius, and delegated, as much as possible, its fulfilment to his pupils. At the utmost, by means of sketches and studies, he supplied the groundwork of the "Fire in the Borgo,"† which, as the masterpiece of the series, has given to the apartment the name of the "Stanza del Incendio."

The "Liber Pontificalis" relates how Leo IV., by making the sign of the Cross, quenched with marvellous quickness a fire which was ravaging the Borgo di San Pietro, the suburb which he had founded and fortified. The difficulty

\* SPRINGER, 317.

† The name Stanza di torre Borgia is now almost forgotten.

of treating such an occurrence pictorially need not be insisted upon, since the wonderful power of the pontifical blessing does not admit of perceptible expression. The person of the Pope in the act of blessing—the feature of the picture which to Leo X. was of capital importance—has been thrown boldly into the background by the artist; here he appears on a loggia of the Vatican, near to which the façade of the then existing Church of St. Peter's is visible, while in the foreground the threatened victims of the raging flames are depicted with broad and powerful strokes, running, amid cries of distress, to the rescue or in flight. The frightful power of fire, when “it breaks through its fetters,” is here represented in a “genre picture of masterful style”\* with such extraordinary actuality that one understands why this particular fresco was such an object of admiration and imitation in the academic epoch. On both sides of the picture ancient palatial buildings, in which the fire is raging, are purposely displayed. On the one on the right hand men are busy trying to quench the flames; two female figures, the modelling of which has hardly a counterpart in painting, and has made the group famous, hold out vessels full of water to the stout-hearted rescuers.† On the left hand the flames have got the mastery, and have driven the inmates to headlong flight. Only one, a mother, is forgetful of her own safety, and holds out her infant in swaddling clothes to the father who has roused himself in terror. Close by a stalwart youth, who has jumped naked from his bed, slides down the wall. On the extreme left a son, in the strength of youth, carries his father, scantily clothed, into the open, like Æneas bearing Anchises; behind him runs a spirited boy, likewise clad with only a few scraps of

\* BURCKHARDT, Cicerone, 670.

† STRZYGOWSKI, 13.

clothing. Amid these incidents, which recall Virgil's description of burning Troy, the group of women in the centre must not be overlooked, since it not only connects the foreground with the two sides of the picture, but also carries the eye back again to the figure of the Pope, in the background, as he makes the sign of blessing. One of the terror-stricken women who have congregated here has thrown herself on the ground and, with outstretched arms, cries to the Pontiff for help; on him also is turned the gaze of a mother whose child has sunk upon its knees in prayer—a touching idyll in the midst of this world of distraction and fear! To the Head of the Church, as to a place of refuge, fly also the groups of people on the steps of the Papal palace—figures of extraordinary beauty, and portrayed with a thorough grasp of what is true in nature.\* All these beautiful details are certainly to be attributed to Raphael's invention; but he is not responsible for their combination, which is in parts defective, nor for the discrepancies in proportion.† It is certain that the execution of the fresco was left entirely to his pupils; the foreground is the work of Giulio Romano and the background that of Penni.

The same considerations hold good in the case of the second fresco, which represents the victory of Leo IV. in the sea-fight of Ostia; only with this difference, that here Giulio Romano has, to a very considerable extent, influenced the composition as a whole.‡ Leo IV., who faces the spectator in the person of Leo X., appears on the left, not far from the shore, enthroned on a fallen pedestal from the ruins of Ostia; behind him are seen two of his chief

\* MÜNTZ, 444 *seq.*, has rightly called special attention to the beauty of this portion of the picture.

† DOLLMAYR, 250.

‡ DOLLMAYR, 251 *seq.*

advisers, Cardinals Medici and Bibbiena; the Pope, with uplifted eyes, gives thanks to heaven for his victory on the sea. The naval action itself fills the background. In front of him captive Saracens are already landing, who are represented as gagged and roughly handled; among them is conspicuous the splendid form of a warrior; the design of this figure was included in the sketch sent by Raphael to Dürer.\* Many of the subjects in this fresco show as clearly as those in the Conflagration in the Borgo how intent at this time Raphael and his school were on the study of ancient models.†

The two other frescoes in the Stanza del Incendio represent scenes from the life of Leo III.: one is the Oath of Purgation against False Accusations, which this Pope "voluntarily and at no man's instigation" took on the 23rd of December, 800, in the Church of St. Peter; the other is the Coronation of Charlemagne, previously held in the same place, in which he assumes the bodily presence of Francis I. No sketches by Raphael, for these ceremonial pictures, which display all the pomp of the Leonine era, are extant. Everything indicates that not only their execution, but also their composition, was the work of

\* The authenticity of this drawing, also preserved in the Albertina, has recently been questioned, but incorrectly. See DOLLMAYR against FISCHER (Raffaels Zeichnungen, Strassburg, 1898) in the Deutschen Lit.-Ztg., 1899, 875, and WICKHOFF in Anz. der Wiener Akad., 1903, 57.

† For Raphael and the antique, *cf.*, besides the special works of GRUYER and PULSKY, also MÜNTZ in Gaz. des Beaux-Arts, 1880; THODE, Die Antiken in den Stichen Marcantons, Leipzig, 1881; LOEWY in Arch. st. dell' Arte, 1896, 241 *seqq.* and NOLHAC, Petites notes sur l'art Italien, Paris, 1887. Traces of Donatello's influence are also discernible in the "Fire in the Borgo"; VÖGE (Raffaels und Donatello, Strassburg, 1896) lays stress on this, somewhat too strongly.



Raphael's pupils. The hard outlines and feeble colouring point to the conclusion that these frescoes come from the hand of Giovanni Francesco Penni.\*

The choice of the events in the reigns of Leo III. and Leo IV., which are represented in the Stanza del Incendio, was, we may be pretty sure, determined by an appropriateness to the historical career of Leo X. which was more easily perceived by his contemporaries than it is by us at the present day. In order to discover in each fresco the circumstance to which it corresponds, we must carefully examine the administration of the Medici Pope previous to the year 1517, instead of losing ourselves among far-fetched surmises and generalities.† An indication of the clearest kind is afforded by the fresco of the victory over the Saracens in the naval battle of Ostia. In the previous course of this history we have shown how preoccupied Leo X. had been, from the beginning of his Pontificate, with the plan of a Crusade. At the time when the scheme of the frescoes was decided upon, the Pope's crusading enthusiasm was at its height. The success of the Christian arms, which the Portuguese envoys had vouched for, and the continuous danger to which the seaboard of the Papal States was exposed from the piratical attacks of the Moslem, from whose hand Leo X. had on one occasion escaped at Ostia, as if by a miracle, must have raised the interest of his contemporaries in this fresco to the highest pitch.‡ Moreover, the arrival of unbelievers as captives, which is seen in the very forefront of the picture, was, for the Romans of Leo's days, a by no means unusual

\* DOLLMAYR, 267 *seq.*

† HETTNER (225 *seq.*) is an example of this. His explanations are useful on points of detail, but he introduces arbitrary and forced meanings into the frescoes, which they are incapable of bearing.

‡ Cf. Vol. VII. of this work, pp. 45, 74 *seqq.*, 158, 213 *seq.*

spectacle.\* What far-reaching hopes were based on Leo X.'s action in this question of a Crusade by an earnest man, Egidio Canisio, the General of the Augustinian Order, may be seen from a passage in his History, in which he represents the overthrow of Islam as already assured, since it is written in the Apocalypse of St. John that victory belongs to the Lion (Leo) of the tribe of Juda.† At a later day, when Leo X. was engaged in his great attempt to unite the Princes of Christendom in an armed league against the unbelievers, the fresco in his chamber in the Vatican may have arisen before his eyes with even greater force of appeal than this sentence of holy writ.

The Coronation of Charlemagne, who appears with the features of Francis I., contains, according to the commonly accepted explanation, a reference to the Papal approval of the French monarch's efforts to secure the Imperial crown during the electoral conflict of 1519.‡ But this interpretation is in the highest degree doubtful. The fresco was finished in 1517, when the vaguest rumours concerning the projects of Francis were current—rumours which sprang up on the occasion of the Conference at Bologna, but had no substantial basis of fact.§ Still less apposite is the view of a more recent investigator, who sees in the picture the expression of the "absolute supremacy of the Church over

\* Cf., besides SANUTO, XXVI., 195, the \*day-book in Cod. Barb., lat. 3552, under date June 8, 1516, Vatican Library.

† HETTNER, 227, has called attention to this.

‡ BURCKHARDT, Cicerone, 669, has established this to a certainty, and many have followed him. When FÖRSTER, II., 74, sees in the fresco, along with the flattering memento of the Conference at Bologna, a hint of Francis I.'s aspirations after the imperial title, the latter suggestion is in direct contradiction to the Pope's behaviour in this question; see Vol. VII. of this work, p. 258.

§ Cf. Vol. VII. of this work, p. 141.

the secular power.”\* Of course, it is correct to say that the ecclesiastical character of the Mediæval Empire is forcibly brought out. But the really essential significance of the picture must be found in the strong accentuation of the duty of supporting the Holy See, which was bound up with the Imperial dignity. To this points the inscription beneath the fresco: “Charles the Great, support and shield of the Roman Church.” Now, if Charlemagne bears the likeness of Francis I., we learn from this what meaning was attached by members of the Roman Curia to the treaty made in October, 1515, with the King of France. By that treaty Francis had pledged himself expressly to protect the States of the Church in their entirety.† It is he who now appears as the champion of the Church, and not the weak and vacillating prince who then bore the Imperial title.‡

If these two frescoes in the Stanza del Incendio thus contain clear allusions to the political activity of Leo X., the two others may likewise bear a reference to his distinctively ecclesiastical government. Two events occupied the first place in point of interest at the time when the arrangements for the fresco decoration of the third Stanza were settled: the close of the Schism and the Council of the Lateran. With the latter the Oath of Purgation of Leo III. is, without doubt, closely connected. The explanation of this fresco also has for long been a

\* HETTNER, 227.

† Cf. Vol. VII. of this work, p. 126 *seq.*

‡ As the political situation had altogether changed in 1521, a public speaker wrote: “Ac sicuti Leo III. cum Carolo ita nunc Leo X. cum Carolo V. . . . ad recipiendas ecclesiae urbes adnuitur” (VENUTI, 156). This passage shows in what general use such comparisons were at that time. Cf. also IO. BAPT. MANTUANUS, *De sacris diebus*, l. 4; *De sanctis Leonibus*. Here the incidents brought forward are the meeting with Attila, the battle of Ostia, and the coronation of the Emperor.

matter of hazardous and forced conjecture. Once again, a simple and yet sound interpretation is afforded by the inscription under the picture: "God, and not Man, is the Judge of Bishops." This principle was laid down in the eleventh session of the Council, on the 19th of December, 1516, and in the Bull *Unam sanctam*, which had again been promulgated simultaneously with the repeal of the Pragmatic Sanction. The highest spiritual authority, it is here declared, must be judged by God alone, and not by men.\*

The connection between the fresco of the quelling of the conflagration in the Borgo and the history of Leo X. presents an enigma of great difficulty. The allusion is, probably, to the close of the Schism, whereby the Pope was able, with unexpected promptitude, to extinguish a perilous intestine fire within the Church.† But along with this motive there is another which cannot be mistaken. The representation of the façade of the old St. Peter's,

\* While BURCKHARDT, Cicerone, 669, and SPRINGER, 325, find the choice of the Oath of Purgation unintelligible, HETTNER, 230, has hit correctly upon the reference to the Bull of Boniface VIII., although his exceedingly arbitrary suppositions deprive his explanation of half its force.

† The meaning here brought forward for the first time has more to recommend it than that of HETTNER, who (226) sees in the "Incendio" an allusion to the indefectibility of miraculous power in the Church as involved in the conception of the Church's sanctity, and recalls to mind the Conciliar decree against Pomponazzi. FÖRSTER, II., 69, gives the "Incendio" a symbolical meaning with reference to the marvellous diplomatic skill of Leo, whereby, in the negotiations at Bologna, he averted the dangers which threatened Italy through Francis I. Likewise GRUYER, Chambres, 272, as against LILIENCRON, in his essays on the pictures in the Stanze (Aüg. Zig., 1883, No. 310) sees in this destruction of a second Troy "the world consumed by the fire of sin" and without hope of salvation save at the hands of the Vicar of Christ.



which was doomed to destruction, the architectural details in the foreground so obviously intended for display and which have nothing to do with the Borgo, might be intended to suggest the zeal with which, from the first, Leo had applied himself to the construction of the new basilica of the Prince of the Apostles. Thus the transference of the real subject of the picture to the background explains itself. Raphael, as the architect of St. Peter's, wished, by means of this fresco, to convey to his patron, who had nominated him the successor of Bramante, a delicate compliment of homage and thanks.\*

After the works in the Stanza del Incendio were finished, there yet remained, for the completion of the adornment of the Pope's state apartments, the mural painting of the great hall next the Stanza d'Eliodoro, which immediately adjoins the Loggie. The choice of subjects for treatment presented difficulties, for a continuation of the line adopted in the Leonine chamber was open to question. Even Leo X. did not refuse to recognize that, by confining Raphael's work to pictures of a merely ceremonial and official character, he was turning his talent into a narrowing groove; that his tasks must again have a wider scope and higher aim, if there was not to be too great an incongruity between the first and the last paintings in the Stanze.† Under these circumstances it was a very happy conception of the Pope's when he fixed, as his choice of subject, on the events in the life of the Emperor Constantine—events belonging to the history of the world, and of a prince under whom Christianity made its victorious entry into Rome, and to whom tradition had ascribed the donation of the States of the Church. To Raphael also was entrusted the

\* Strzygowski, with whom I discussed the subject in Rome, was of opinion that this is the only correct interpretation.

† BURCKHARDT, *Cicerone*, 670.

task of settling the beautiful general arrangement of this hall. Of the frescoes, that of Constantine's victory at the Milvian Bridge is, in all certainty, drawn from a detailed sketch by the master himself. The grandeur of style which runs through this whole fresco, executed by Giulio Romano, shows the touch of a master of the first rank. If we turn our eyes from the cold grey colouring of the fresco, and, with the aid of an engraving, scrutinize the drawing alone, we receive the impression that this, the noblest battle-piece in the world, can have come from the hand of Raphael alone.\*

While Raphael's pupils were painting the Leonine hall, their master was engaged on the designs for the tapestries, which on Church festivals were to adorn the lower walls of the Sixtine Chapel in place of the older hangings now worn out and shabby. This work must have come to an end about Christmas, 1516, after several years' application. It consisted of ten lightly-tinted cartoons, of the exact size and shape which were to be reproduced in the looms, on which the chief events in the lives of St. Peter and St. Paul were painted in distemper. For each cartoon the Pope paid one hundred gold ducats.†

At that time the execution of the tapestries could only be carried out in Flanders. The former headquarters for the fabrication of such articles in that country, Arras, whence from an early period the Italians had given the name

\* DOLLMAYR, 348, attributes the whole with certainty to Giulio Romano, while Wickhoff adheres to his belief that there previously existed a fairly detailed sketch by Raphael; so also ZIMMERMANN, *Zeitalter der Renaissance*, II., 484. Cf. also MINGHETTI, 233, and ROSENBERG, *Raffael* (1904), 25.

† Marcantonio Michiel in CICOONA, 406. Two accounts of June 15, 1515 (300 ducats), and December 20, 1516 (134 ducats), in FEA, *Notizie*, 7-8.

“Arazzi” to the productions of the weaver’s skill,\* had, ever since its capture by Louis XI. in 1477, been unable to maintain so important a manufacture.† Brussels‡ had for a long time become the centre for this industry, and thither accordingly Leo X. also turned.§ The despatch of the cartoons to Brussels must have followed without delay, since already, at the end of July, 1517, Cardinal Luigi d’Aragona was able, during his stay in that city, to admire the first of the designs, the Committal of the Keys to Peter. The Cardinal, who was a man of artistic tastes, visited the workshops in person; in his opinion the whole series of tapestries would be reckoned among the most wonderful achievements of Christian Art.|| The execution in wool, silk, and gold thread was, under the supervision of Raphael’s pupil Bernhard van Orley,¶ in the hands of Peter van Aelst, who, besides the title of Court Purveyor to His Holiness, received for each piece of tapestry 1500 ducats, making a total of 15,000.\*\*

\* Cf. MÜNTZ, *Hist. de la tapisserie*, 5, and GERSPACH in the *Rev. de l’Art chrét.*, 1901, 94.

† See the transactions as given by MÜNTZ, *Tapiss. de Raphaël*, 4, n. 1.

‡ See PINCHART, *Hist. de la tapisserie dans les Flandres*, Paris, 1878–1885, 118 *seq.*

§ MÜNTZ, *Chronique des Arts*, 1876, 346 *seq.*, and *Hist. de la tapisserie*, 20, draws this conclusion correctly from the contract of June 27, 1520 (given on p. 25), in which Brussels is not mentioned. All doubt is removed by the express testimony of Antonio de Beatis. See following note.

|| Cf. PASTOR, *Reise des Kardinal’s Luigi d’Aragona*, 65, 117. This source of information is also of importance for removing the doubt raised by GERSPACH in the *Rev. de l’Art chrét.*, 1901, 106.

¶ Again in the Netherlands about 1515; see WAUTERS, *B. v. Orley*, Paris, 1893, 14.

\*\* Marcantonio Michiel in CICOGLA, 406. The higher amounts given by Paris de Grassis, Panvinus, and Vasari are exaggerations; see MÜNTZ, *Raphaël*, 482.

By the beginning of July, 1519, three of the hangings had reached Rome: the Venetian Ambassador writes in admiration of their fine workmanship and of their value.\* Four more must have come to hand in the autumn; for it is on record that the Pope ordered seven of these new tapestries, as beautiful as they were costly, to be hung in the Sistine Chapel on St. Stephen's day, below the frescoes on the walls.† Although here and there the voice of envy found expression in unfavourable criticism, yet the general impression was one of unmixed admiration. "All present in the Chapel," relates the Papal Master of Ceremonies, Paris de Grassis, "were struck at the sight of these noble tapestries, which, with universal consent, were adjudged to be among the things of beauty which cannot be surpassed in all the world.‡ The Venetian Marcantonio Michiel bears witness that in the general opinion these tapestries are the most beautiful productions of their kind that have ever yet been wrought; they excel those in the antechamber of Julius II. as much as the latter surpass

\* De moliti pezzi di arazzi che'l Pontefice fa fare in Fiandra per fornire le camere et capella finora ne sono stati portati tre di tanta perfectione et pretio che vagliono cento ducati el brazo ne si stimano cari. Letter of July 4, 1519, in SANUTO, XXVII., 470. This has escaped Müntz's notice in a strange way, but it confirms his conclusions directed against PASSAVANT (*Chronique des arts*, 1876, 254, and *Hist. de la tapisserie*, 20).

† Cf. CICOGLA, Marcantonio Michiel, 405-406, and Paris de Grassis in PASSAVANT, II., 232. See also MINGHETTI, 161. Leo X. also lived to see the arrival of the three cartoons now wanting. This is gathered with certainty from the Appendix to the *\*Inventarium bonorum in foraria Leonis X.* of 1518 (State Archives, Rome) in which (fol. 30) the ten tapestries are described as "Panni pretiosissimi de la S<sup>ta</sup> di papa Leone ad uso della capella." MÜNTZ, *Chronique des Arts*, 1876, 247, and *Hist. de la tapisserie*, 19, n. 3, has given the passages bearing on the point.

‡ PASSAVANT, II., 232.



those of the Marquis of Mantua, or those in the palace of the King of Naples.\* The latest criticism is more matter-of-fact, and discovers technical faults due to defective execution.† Not only Raphael's own contemporaries but later generations have overlooked these defects. "A marvellous and astonishing work," writes Vasari, "for it passes human wit to understand how it is possible for the interweaving of threads so to represent in the woof the hairs of the head and beard or so to reproduce the consistency of human flesh, and the impression made by the whole is rather that of a miracle than of a work of human skill. Water, animals, and buildings are represented in such perfection that they appear not to have been woven on the loom, but to have been painted with the brush."‡

The best evidence both of the extent and the continuity of this great admiration of the tapestries is afforded by the numerous plates§ which were struck, and by the copies, in the form of hand-worked carpets, which were already forthcoming, in a certain quantity, before the close of the 16th century. Of the latter, some of the finest specimens adorn, at the present day, the art collections of Berlin, Dresden, Madrid, and Vienna, and also the Cathedral of Loreto.||

The Vatican originals have undergone many vicissitudes which reflect in a remarkable way the changing fortunes of the Papal power. After the death of Leo X. they were

\* CICOGNA, Marcantonio Michiel, 405-406.

† Cf. GERSPACH, *Rev. de l'art chrét.*, 1901, 109 *seq.*

‡ VASARI, VIII., 47-48.

§ Cf. PASSAVANT, II., 256 *seq.*; RULAND, *Works of Raphael*, London, 1876; FARABULINI, 33 *seq.*; MÜNTZ, *Tapiss. de Raphaël*, 21 *seq.*

|| Cf. PASSAVANT, II., 273 *seq.*; WAAGEN, *Die Kartons von Raffael*, Berlin, 1860; FARABULINI, 28; MÜNTZ, *Tapiss. de Raphaël*, 24 *seq.*, *Jahrb. d. kunsthistor. Sammlungen d. Kaiserhauses*, II., 208 *seq.* See also *Gazette des Beaux-Arts*, XXIV. (1900), 224.

pawned, on account of the then existing financial distress,\* but were afterwards redeemed and again restored to the Sixtine Chapel. They were still conspicuous there when, in May, 1527, the corpse of the Constable de Bourbon found a shelter in that sanctuary.† Soon, however, the gold threads in their tissue aroused the love of plunder in the mercenaries. Since an attempt to extract them by melting, which was tried on the lower part of the hanging representing the Blinding of Elymas, led to little result, at any rate several of the pieces, if not all, were put up for sale. Already in 1530 negotiations were pending for the repurchase of a piece of tapestry stolen during the sack of the city.‡ In an inventory of 1544, seven hangings are enumerated among the contents of the Papal palace. Under Julius III. two more pieces were restored which had been carried away from Venice to Constantinople.§ Henceforward they were used not only in the decoration of the Sixtine Chapel, but also of the Piazza of St. Peter's on Corpus Christi Day.|| Goethe, who saw them, with admiration, on the latter occasion, in 1787, thought that they were the only works of Raphael which did not appear insignificant after looking at the frescoes of Michael Angelo in the Sixtine Chapel.¶ During the storm of the French Revolution the tapestries were once more removed from

\* See the note of December 17, 1521, to the above-mentioned \*Inventarium, printed by Müntz in the *Chronique des Arts*, 1876, 247, and *Hist. de la tapisserie*, 21, N. 1.

† This statement of SANUTO, XLV., 418, has hitherto been passed over by all inquirers into the history of the tapestries; *cf.* SANUTO, XLII., 700.

‡ *Cf.* GAYE, II., 222.

§ MÜNTZ, *Chronique des Arts*, 1876, 254, and *Hist. de la tapisserie*, 21. *Cf.* LANCIANI, II., 29.

|| TORRIGI, *Grotte*, 142.

¶ *Cf.* SCHUCHARDT, *Goethes ital. Reise*, I., 400 *seq.*

Rome. In the beginning of 1798 they were, along with the furniture of the Pope, put up to auction and bought by French dealers in old furniture. The latter conveyed them to Genoa and then to Paris, where for a considerable time they were exposed to view in the courts of the Louvre. Their purchase by the French Government fell through on financial grounds.\* At length Pius VII., just before his journey into France, secured the restoration of these treasures to his palace. In 1814 they were placed, by order of the Pope, in the so-called chamber of Pius V.; hence they were transferred by Gregory XVI. to the corridor adjoining the Galleria dei Candelabri, which since then has been called the Galleria degli Arazzi.†

It is owing to these mischances that the tapestries to-day show only a faint reflection of their former splendour. The bright and delicate colours, especially in the flesh tints, have become faded; many places have been coarsely restored; from one tapestry the under half has been taken away, to others the wrong borders have been attached. In spite of this it is impossible not to recognize, still underlying all, one of the ripest creations of the great master. The full impression of Raphael's genius can indeed only be given back to us by the cartoons which were left behind at Brussels and were not reclaimed by the successors of Leo X.‡ Seven of these original drawings, which Rubens discovered simultaneously in 1630, belong to the art collection of the English Crown, and form to-day one

\* Cf. MÜNTZ, *Hist. de la tapisserie*, 21 *seq.*

† They are here mixed with the other tapestries which are not by Raphael and are not exhibited to advantage. The restoration begun under Pius IX. was completed by his successor Leo XIII. Cf. GENTILI, *Memoria sulla conservazione degli arazzi*, Roma, 1886, and *Arazzi antichi e moderni*, Roma, 1897, 12.

‡ Cf. FARABULINI, 29.

of the most noteworthy objects in the South Kensington Museum, London.

According to Vasari, Penni gave his master great assistance in painting the cartoons for the tapestries in the Papal Chapel.\* On the strength of this information and from personal observation the older biographers of Raphael assume that only in the Miraculous Draught of Fishes is the principal work to be attributed to his own hand, and that in all the remaining London cartoons only the drawing and certain single portions, especially the heads, belong to him.† More recently even this latter claim has been gainsaid. An experienced art student has maintained, with great acuteness and learning, but without having seen the originals in London, the hypothesis that the composition as it stands is the work of Penni, and that Raphael had only thrown off the first and often very hasty sketches.‡ This view is, however, an untenable one. Art critics of eminence, before and since, hold fast, with perfect justice, to the opinion that Raphael's participation in the cartoons taken from scenes from the history of the Apostles, cannot be narrowed down to this extent. Certainly an authentic drawing of the master's exists only for the one cartoon of the Call of St. Peter,§ but, for the others also, sketches, corresponding more or less, from Raphael's own hand, must have been forthcoming. "The perfection of the individual figures in form, dress, gesture, and expression is so thoroughly impressed with the stamp of the master's own hand, that it seems impossible to substitute for it the hand of a disciple."|| If not in all

\* VASARI, VIII., 242.

† PASSAVANT, II., 253 *seq.* Cf. his "Reise nach England," 39.

‡ DOLLMAYR, 255 *seq.*, 266.

§ In the Windsor Collection.

|| In agreement are WEESE in Repert. f. Kunstwissensch., XIX., 371



the seven, yet certainly in four of the London cartoons, all the essential traits can be assigned to Raphael and to him only.\* The figures, in their organic structure and in the convincing force of their expression, reveal the great and immediate influence of the presiding genius which not only threw out the general design of the composition, but, almost down to the least detail, controlled its arrangement. This does not exclude the certainty that Penni had a more

*seq.*; MÜNTZ in *Athenaeum*, 1896, July, 71 *seq.*; FABRICZY in the *Allgem. Zeitung*, 1897, Beil. No. 215; STEINMANN, *Rom*, 205; V. BILDT, *Nineteenth Century*, 1904, LVI., 999. Müntz points out especially that Dollmayr's chief ground of support is a hypothetical picture, the Madonna di Monteluce, which the latter was the first to bring into the field, and for which, as an original work of Penni's, he himself stood sponsor. WÖLFFLIN (*Klassische Kunst*, 105 *seq.*), who, as well as BERENSON (*The Central Italian Painters of the Renaissance*, New York, 1897) and FISCHER (*Raffaels Zeichnungen*, Strassburg, 1898, *cf.* *Repert.*, XXI., 494 *seq.*), is in favour of Dollmayr's theory, yet declares: "Some of the cartoons, however, are so perfect that it is impossible not to perceive the immediate presence of Raphael's genius." Wickhoff, finally, who is the best connoisseur of Raphael's hand drawings, modifies Dollmayr's hypothesis substantially. In the *Committal of the Keys to Peter*, Raphael first drew the whole group of figures from models, leaving the execution of the cartoon to Penni. It must not be assumed, however, that Penni henceforward had an entirely free hand. Raphael, who was constantly in and out of the studio, would naturally outline the drapery, arrange the background, and so forth, with broad strokes of his pencil, although he had not time at his disposal to carry out the grouping, which was left over to Penni. But even, granted that the latter placed the figures in relief, the whole effect of the work is instinct with the great and ever-widening creative power of Penni's master. I may here mention that J. Burckhardt also, in a conversation I had with him in 1895, said most decisively that Dollmayr had carried his theory much too far.

\* I am in agreement with STRZYGOWSKI (62 *seq.*) that in the *Draught of Fishes*, the *Healing of the Lame Man*, the *Sacrifice at Lystra*, and the *St. Paul at Athens*, all the essential features are Raphael's.

or less extensive share in the colouring of the cartoons, but against the assumption that the pupil had worked in almost entire independence of his master, strong grounds can be adduced in addition to those already brought forward on internal evidence. Even if too much weight is not attached to the circumstance that, in the accounts, as well as in the estimation of all his contemporaries, the cartoons were adjudged to be the work of Raphael, there is yet another consideration which has a most important bearing on the balance of evidence, namely, that Penni, at the time of their execution, had only just entered on his twentieth year.\* This fact gives substantial support to the supposition that his workmanship in its entirety was under the direction and guidance of a superior hand. It is, at any rate, in the highest degree unlikely that so young a man should have produced, almost unaided, so great a work. On the other hand, Penni's contribution to the colouring of the cartoons was certainly an important one. It is very difficult to assign with certainty the extent of Raphael's co-operation in details. But that his influence here is also unmistakable must be admitted by anyone who has had an opportunity of studying the originals in London; the effect of the colours is so remarkable, especially in forming a judgment on the whole, that not even the best photograph can give a true reproduction of the pictures.

How great Raphael's influence must have been on the seven London cartoons is best shown by comparing them, as regards composition and execution, with the three remaining tapestries† of the first series, of which the

\* According to MÜNTZ, *loc. cit.*, Penni was born not earlier than 1496.

† "Arazzi della scuola vecchia," as distinguished from the "Arazzi della scuola nuova."

drawings have been lost. The want of spontaneity, the pettiness, the exaggeration, which in the latter strike the beholder, show that, in these pictures (the Stoning of St. Stephen, the Conversion of St. Paul and the imprisonment of the latter) the pupils were left to themselves.

Still less successful is the second series of tapestries, representing scenes in the life of Christ,\* set on foot by Leo X., but only finished under Clement VII. The drawings for a third series of wrought tapestries, which Leo X., in his love of sumptuous adornment, had ordered Peter van Aelst to prepare in Brussels, contained a sketch by Tommaso Vincidor, that of the Children at Play (*Giuochi di Putti*). This last-named pupil of Raphael, who had been sent by the Pope to Brussels for the special purpose of superintending the work, informs his master, in a letter of the 20th of July, 1521, that he had completed the cartoon of the *Giuochi di Putti*, the most beautiful and the most costly hanging that had ever yet been seen.†

The tapestries of the first series are of such high importance that they are entitled to something more than a cursory notice in this work. They depict with incomparable skill and great dramatic effect the infancy of the Church; one half represents events from the history of St. Peter, the other, those from that of St. Paul. Their arrangement in the Sixtine Chapel‡ was probably

\* FABRICZY correctly emphasizes this, *loc. cit.*

† MÜNTZ, *Hist. de la tapiss.*, 26 *seq.*, 49 *seq.*; *Tapisseries de Raphaël*, 47 *seq.* The text of T. Vincidor's letter has been given by Müntz in the *Athenaeum*, *loc. cit.*, 73; *cf.* GRIMM, *Essays N.F.*, Berlin, 1875, 94 *seq.*

‡ *Cf.* STEINMANN, *Die Anordnung der Teppiche Raffaels in der Sixtinischen Kapelle*, in *Jahrb. d. preuss. Kunstsamml.*, XXIII, 186-195. This needs to be supplemented in only one particular, that FÖRSTER (II., 81 *seq.*), had already pronounced against the hitherto almost generally accepted arrangement of BUNSEN-PLATNER (II., 2, 410).

determined with regard to the circumstance that to the right and left of the entrance, galleries had been erected from which ladies could witness the ceremonies on greater festivals, a permission which had never been granted in the case of the Sixtine Chapel previous to Leo X.\* Where the galleries ended the tapestries began, two on each side of the space allotted to the laity and three on each side of the sanctuary. On the left, or Gospel side of the wall the Call of St. Peter hung below the Destruction of Core and his Company ; under the Giving of the Law on Sinai, the Healing of the Lame Man ; under the Passage of the Red Sea, the Death of Ananias ; under the Infancy of Moses, the Stoning of St. Stephen ; under the Circumcision of Moses, the Miraculous Draught of Fishes. On the right, or Epistle side, under the Baptism of Christ was hung the Conversion of the Apostle St. Paul ; under the Purification Offerings of the Lepers, the Blinding of Elymas ; under the Call of the first Disciples, the Sacrifice at Lystra ; under the Sermon on the Mount, the Deliverance of St. Paul from Prison ; under the Committal of the Keys, the Preaching of St. Paul at Athens. This arrangement clearly shows the skill and care with which the choice of subjects for the tapestries had been made. They cover the walls of the Chapel as far as the galleries, and narrate in close chronological order the deeds of the Apostles, simply continuing the series set forth in the wall paintings. The only deviation from the chronological sequence is in the introduction of St. Peter's

•

Förster's attempt at a better arrangement was bound to fail, since he was unaware of the alterations in the Cancellata under Gregory XIII. (STEINMANN, *Sixt. Kapelle*, I., 158 *seq.*). Against Bunsen, see also GERSPACH in *Rev. de l'Art chrét.*, 1901, 96 *seq.* J. VON SCHMIDT (*Ueber Anordnung und Komposition der Teppiche Raffaels*, in *Der Zeitschrift für bildende Kunst*, 1904, 285 *seq.*) agrees with Steinmann.

\* Paris de Grassis, ed. ARMELLINI, 81.



Miraculous Draught of Fishes between the Papal throne and the altar wall—an arrangement which is accounted for by the Pope's wish to decorate the beginning and end of the wall, against which his throne was placed, with subjects illustrative of the Papal primacy.\*

The large compositions in the central panels of the tapestries were surrounded by broad, ornamental borders, all of which have certainly not been preserved.† The perpendicular borders, corresponding to the pillars of the Chapel, display grotesque patterns in colour on a white or gold ground; allegorical figures of great beauty are grouped together at intervals, between vases and branch work. This treatment of the borders was also partly intended to form a contrast to the main subjects portrayed, and thus to throw the latter into strong relief. Thus it is not a mere accident that the Fates and the Hours form the framework for the appointment of St. Peter to the office of Chief Shepherd, for here the contrast implied is that between the power of time and fate over the bodies of men, and the power of the keys of Christ's Vicar over their souls.‡ The transverse strips contain small pictures in a gold-bronze colour arranged in a sort of frieze. Under the subjects taken from the life of St. Paul, these miniature designs have reference to the leading picture above them, and develop the narrative which it illustrates; but under those taken from the life of St. Peter, certainly at the special wish of the Pope, incidents from the career of the

\* STEINMANN in *Jahrb. d. preuss. Kunstsamml.*, XXIII., 194-195.

† For the borders the fullest treatment is in MÜNTZ, *Tapiss. de Raphaël*, 29 *seq.*, and GERSPACH, 112 *seq.* Cf. also STEINMANN, *loc. cit.*, 195. Müntz gives photographs of the borders collectively. Hitherto only Volpato's pieces had been reproduced. Cf. GERSPACH in *Atti d. congresso stor. internaz. di Roma*, VII., 315 *seq.*

‡ PIPER, *Mythologie der christl. Kunst*, II., 340.

latter, previous to his election, appear, among them being some even of the less glorious, such as his flight from Florence in disguise and his capture at the battle of Ravenna. "To this child of fortune, everything that befell him in the course of his experience appeared not only worthy of note, but fit subject for memorial."\* By the side of this prentice work the chief pictures stand out all the more impressively; and yet it is only the cartoons which can impart their full impression, for not even the most perfect textile skill was capable of reproducing the original purity of the designs.†

The series of cartoons in preservation, on which time has certainly left traces of its passage,‡ begins with the Miraculous Draught of Fishes.§ The artist has closely

\* BURCKHARDT, *Cicerone*, 675. Cf. RIO, *Michel-Ange et Raphaël*, 192-193. See also for remarks on the pictures on the brackets, STEINMANN, *loc. cit.* 188 *seq.*

† Cf. SPRINGER, 290. The objection often made, that Raphael, in composing his cartoons, did not pay sufficient attention to the technique of the looms, is, generally speaking, incorrect; see the good explanation of ZIMMERMANN, II., 485 *seq.* But it is not incorrect to say that in some of the cartoons, through inattention to the process of weaving, the reverse side does not give the picture correctly. The Sacrifice at Lystra and the Blinding of Elymas lose on being turned round; see WÖLFFLIN, 114. In disagreement with the last-named critic, I do not think that, as regards the St. Paul at Athens, this point is immaterial. The Apostle especially gains very remarkably when seen on the reverse side.

‡ The Blinding of Elymas and the Healing of the Man lame from his birth have suffered most.

§ The following descriptions are based on notes which I jotted down in the autumn of 1900, during a stay in London for the purpose of studying the cartoons. Cf. also PASSAVANT, I., 272, and II., 253 *seq.*; WAAGEN, *Kunstwerke und Künstler in England*, I., 367 *seq.*; FÖRSTER, II., 83 *seq.*; SPRINGER, 270 *seq.*; RIO, *Michel-Ange et Raphaël*, 189 *seq.*; MÜNTZ, *Raphaël*, 486 *seq.*; STRZYGOWSKI, 62 *seq.*; WÖLFFLIN, 105 *seq.* All the numerous early copies (cf. PASSAVANT,

followed the narrative in the fifth chapter of St. Luke's gospel. In the early morning Jesus had preached to the multitudes from the ship on the lake of Genesareth, and had then put out with Peter: the latter, at his Lord's bidding, had once more let down his nets. Peter had obeyed the Master's word, although he had toiled all the night and had caught nothing. And lo! his obedience is wondrously rewarded; the nets cannot contain the fishes, they begin to break; a second boat, in which are John and James, is signalled to bring help; but so great is the load of fishes that both the boats are in danger of sinking. All are overpowered with amazement at the mighty wonder; but Peter flings himself at Jesus' feet under a deep sense of unworthiness. "Depart from me, for I am a sinful man." The Lord answers gently, "Fear not, from henceforth thou shalt catch men."

It is this incident which the artist has portrayed. In front are two boats sunk deep in the water through the overdraught of fishes, and purposely depicted of so small a size that the figures of those they carry stand out in commanding proportions. In one of the two little vessels are John and James, rough, downright fishermen, busily engaged in securing the overabundant haul, while beside them the steersman does all he can to keep the balance of the too heavily freighted craft. At the prow of the other boat, in majestic calm, sits our Lord, wearing a bright blue garment with a white mantle, and seemingly alight with a sheen of glory; His hand is uplifted, and He

*loc. cit.*; RULAND, Works of Raphael, London, 1876; MÜNTZ, *Historiens* 112 *seq.*), have been put in the shade by the photographs of the originals by Braun of Dornach. Müntz too (*Tapiss. de Raphaël*) has reproduced the cartoons in fine copper plates from original photographs. He also gives a collection of photographic copies in facsimile of the sketches from which the cartoons were taken.



has just spoken the momentous words to Peter. On the face of the chief Apostle, who entreats his Master with folded hands, is displayed, with inimitable art, the humblest faith, the utmost devotion, and the deepest happiness. Behind Peter, who is clad in blue, stands a second disciple in green, probably Andrew, with bent breast and outstretched arms. This picture of unbounded devotion to Christ emphasizes in the most skilful way the impression made by the figure of Peter. A still more striking instance of Raphael's artistic mastery is disclosed in the way in which he brings the group of figures in the boats into one line, which, starting from that of the steersman, culminates in Andrew, sinks again to a lower level in Peter, and once more finds its point of elevation in Christ. "To Him all leads ; the action of the picture finds its centre in Him, and although small in size and placed at the utmost edge of the composition, the figure of Jesus dominates all."\*

The mysterious charm which rests over the whole scene is heightened by the highly poetical character of the landscape: it is the fresh early morning, a light breeze stirs the garments and hair of the fishermen, the waters of the lake sparkle bright and clear, reflecting the figures. In the near distance appears the city of Capharnaum, with the crowds still excited by the teaching of the Lord ; while in the foreground on the shore are shells, crab-fish, and a group of herons, with gaping bills, eager to be fed.

The next picture has the closest connection with the miraculous draught of fishes, the symbol of Peter's apostolic mission. Before the Lord appoints him as His vicar on earth, He again blesses his draught of fishes ; but this time the nets do not break. After the threefold avowal of his love, the Saviour, with the thrice repeated words, "Feed

\* WÖLFFLIN, 105 : "No such composition ever came before from the hand of man."



my lambs, feed my sheep," ordained him to the chief Pastorate over all the redeemed on earth, nor excluding the Apostles themselves. The scene of this event, as described by St. John (xxi. 11-17) was also the lake of Genesareth, which the artist has introduced in the background. The principal personage, next to the supreme figure of the Saviour, is the kneeling chief of the Apostles.

In the foreground appears the glorified form of the risen Jesus, with the marks of the wounds in His hands and feet. He is covered with a white garment sown with golden stars, which leaves the breast and one arm free. As though He were passing them by He is half turned towards His disciples with an expression of unspeakable love and sublimity; for the words, "Feed my lambs, feed my sheep," have been spoken already. Pointing with one hand to Peter and with the other to the lambs, He gives by this double gesture the most emphatic expression to His command. In sharpest contrast to the supernatural calm on the countenance of the risen Lord is the excited demeanour of the disciples. Peter, who is clothed in orange-coloured vesture, overpowered by the task committed to him, has sunk upon his knees in ardent supplication, and gazes upwards on his Master with a look of overflowing gratitude. No power on earth shall wrest from him the keys committed to him, and he presses the symbols of his new authority eagerly against his beating heart. The rest of the disciples have drawn close together in deep agitation. Some, like John, may wear a look of joyous entreaty, but on the faces of the others is stamped amazement at the sudden appearance of their Master among them.\* The whole composition is again set amidst harmonious landscape scenery.

\* Cf. GRIMM, *Leben Raphaels*, 397 *seq.*, where the earlier explanation by Dubos of the astonishment of the disciples is, with justice, rejected.

The subject illustrated in these first two pictures is the most momentous event in the Church's history, the institution of the Primacy. While Raphael here follows the Gospels, in the succeeding cartoons he takes the Acts of the Apostles as his guide and adheres to them with great fidelity. It was with deliberate intention that the painter or his theological adviser discarded any attempt to portray the numerous instances in which the history of St. Peter came in touch with that of the Eternal City and which had been so often depicted already.\* The "Book of Books" was the only source from which he drew his inspiration ; herein with deep insight he made his choice of incidents, at once dramatic and symbolical, whereby to convey unique and striking illustrations of the Church's power to heal and bless, to judge and punish, and to be the apostolic teacher of mankind.

How the Church blesses and heals is set forth in the miracle wrought by Peter on the beggar who was lame from his birth. In accordance with the book of the Acts (chap. iii), the scene of the miracle is the "Beautiful Gate of the Temple" at Jerusalem. Three twisted columns, entwined with clusters of grapes, like those which stood in the old Church of St. Peter and were said to have come from Solomon's Temple, divide the picture into three clearly-marked groups. In the centre the miracle takes place ; Peter, with an expression of great dignity and penetrated by faith in the power of the Divine Word, raises the lame man, who is represented with wonderful fidelity to nature, "in the name of Jesus of Nazareth," and bids him walk, while John, full of love and compassion, points to the victim of misfortune ; on both sides are men and women whose countenances reflect the most varied expressions of sympathy, joy, curiosity, and fear. Another misshapen

\* See MÜNTZ, *Tapiss. de Raphaël*, 6 *seq.*

creature, leaning on a crutch, is already dragging himself forward, filled with hope. Children run to and fro heedless of all that is going on, lovely figures which efface the revolting impression made by the cripple's deformity.

It is the task of the Church, however, not only to heal and bless, but to judge and punish. This truth is the subject of the fourth cartoon; on a platform, in the centre, stands the assembly of the Apostles, earnest and solemn figures; on one side the faithful are bringing their gifts, which, on the other, are being distributed to the needy. In the foreground, Ananias, to the consternation of those around him, has sunk dying on the ground, for at that very moment Peter, stepping forth from the ranks of his colleagues, has pronounced with power, as the organ of the Holy Spirit, the doom on the deceiver, which has straightway been carried out. "Ananias, why hath Satan tempted thy heart, that thou shouldst lie to the Holy Ghost, and by fraud keep part of the price of the land? Thou hast not lied to men, but to God." At Peter's side stands another majestic Apostle with his hand lifted up to heaven, from whence the judgment proceeds; he glances towards Sapphira, as she draws near on the right hand. Her look is cunning, and while she holds the money in one hand, she withdraws some of the coins with the other, unconscious of the vengeance which has swiftly overtaken her husband and is now to overtake her.\*

Only three cartoons are preserved from the series celebrating the life of St. Paul. The first, the Blinding of

\* Goethe was especially struck by this picture; see SCHUCHARDT, I., 404. GRIMM, *Leben Raphaels*, 407, instances the judgment of Ananias, in which the dramatic element is seen in its purest expression, as his highest achievement in composition. Cf. also WAAGEN, I., 367.

the sorcerer Elymas, is a worthy counterpart to the Punishment of Ananias. The Apostle of the Gentiles and the impostor who was bent on thwarting the Proconsul Sergius Paulus in his search for the true faith, are confronted face to face. Paul, full of lofty calm, in which the power of faith reveals itself, only stretches out one hand to punish. Filled with the Holy Ghost, he speaks the words, "Thou shalt be blind," and, at the same moment, Elymas is stricken. "There fell a mist and darkness upon him," as the Scripture says, "and going about, he sought someone to lead him by the hand" (Acts xiii. 11). Raphael has brought this out admirably. The wretched Elymas is the picture of misery. He is distorted with terror at the sudden loss of sight, and with half-opened mouth, and his head with its sightless eyes bent forward, as if in quest of something, with uncertain steps he gropes forward, stretching out the finger-tips of both hands. Raphael has here produced "an insurpassable picture of the state of blindness." The terrified Proconsul, who is enthroned in the centre, and his companions, dumbfounded with astonishment, are less successful. The opinion is justified that Raphael had withdrawn his attention from this portion of the picture.\*

To him, however, the two next cartoons must certainly be attributed. The sixth depicts the excitement of the people of Lystra at the miracle worked by St. Paul, their readiness to offer sacrifice to him and Barnabas as gods, and the strenuous efforts of the latter to prevent them; Paul rends his garments in grief at the infatuation of these heathen people (Acts xiv.). The painter, with wise discrimination, has transferred the figures of the Apostles to an elevated standpoint apart from the other figures. The incident of the sacrifice, freely adapted from an ancient

\* WÖLFFLIN, 113.



bas-relief, is treated in an extremely noble manner. Magnificent also are the bold architectural details in the background, where the figure of the ancient deity by the side of Paul is suggestively conspicuous. The figure of the Apostle, under the influence of the most varying emotions, the priests busily intent on the rites of sacrifice, and the uncouth features of the healed cripple, beaming with thankfulness, are all represented with incomparable skill.

In the seventh cartoon, St. Paul Preaching at Athens, the genius of Raphael reveals itself in a quite inimitable manner. Hardly ever has a grander or nobler representation been given of the fiery-hearted man who, at the call of God, devoted the whole force of his mighty intellect and soul to the world-embracing task of Christianizing the Græco-Roman civilization. Raphael has applied all the resources of his art to depict the "chosen vessel" as the spiritual centre of his picture. High above all stands the great teacher in his green robe and red mantle, almost in the very forefront of the picture, like a pillar of the faith, on the Hill of Mars, which is indicated by the temple building\* and the statue of Arês. Fully possessed by his apostolic calling, he proclaims "Jesus and the Resurrection" (Acts xvii. 18 *seqq.*). The Apostle, whose attitude and garb show clear traces of the Paul of Masaccio in the Brancacci Chapel, holds both arms up to heaven and has advanced to the very edge of the steps above which he stands. This powerful figure, full of a splendid

\* One is a copy of Bramante's Tempietto in San Pietro in Montorio—a tribute of homage from Raphael to his friend and teacher. STRZYGOWSKI (63) is quite right in remarking that, if the architectural details in the background were removed, St. Paul would be still more imposing: "Michael Angelo himself could not have surpassed the creator of this figure."

apostolic majesty, when once seen can never again be forgotten; the deep earnestness and weighty eloquence of this incomparable preacher radiate from him through the circle of his hearers. Paul dominates all the rest, not merely because he stands on a higher level, but also because his hearers are, without exception, drawn on a smaller scale. Finally, the most thorough examination only increases still further the impression produced by this lofty figure. Like some unearthly apparition he holds fast his auditory, who cannot shake off the spell of his inspiring words. On the faces of his hearers are reflected manifold emotions: reluctant attention, quick interchange of opinion, critical reflection, silent doubt. Two persons only are fully convinced of the truth of the new doctrines, a man and a woman, who come quickly forward on the left hand of the steps; especially in the burning glance and outstretched hands of the former do we see the signs of ecstatic self-surrender to the God who, from henceforth, shall be no more "unknown," and a blessed rejoicing in the promise of immortal life. Here Raphael follows with exactitude the narrative of the Scripture, which states that only a few persons adhered to the Apostle and believed, among whom were Dionysius and a woman named Damaris. In the Preaching of St. Paul the whole history of the Church is summed up, as if in a few words—the apostolic message of the truth, its rejection by a great portion of mankind, and its faithful acceptance by the elect.

The cartoons of Raphael are, it has been said, the counterpart in modern art of the classic sculptures of the Parthenon.\* Higher praise can hardly be given, and in

\* SPRINGER, 284. Cf. also WOLTMANN, II., 658 *seq.*, and MINGHETTI, 156 *seq.* Even RIO'S (Michel-Ange et Raphaël, 188 *seq.*) appreciation of the tapestries is unqualified. Of the Preaching of St.

presence of the Draught of Fishes and of the St. Paul at Athens, such an encomium is intelligible. But even if less than this is conceded, it must be admitted that these compositions are worthy of a place beneath the ceiling of Michael Angelo;\* they are penetrated by a spirit of genuine faith, and are a noble offspring of the Renaissance, unsurpassed in the startling fidelity with which they portray the grand and simple narratives of Holy Scripture.† They mark, in the evolution of Raphael's powers, the beginning of the period in which his creative processes reached their highest point, when, out of the depths of his ripened experience and under the influence of antiquity and of Michael Angelo, he achieved "works of unapproachable grandeur, in which all the elements of a grand style, space, proportion, light, and expression form an imposing whole in harmonious combination."‡ In many respects the tapestries show Raphael at his best; taken as a whole, the boldness, freedom, and grandeur of their traits show how closely the master had assimilated the spirit of Eternal Rome.

The influence of the tapestries on later art cannot be estimated; it has been still greater than that of the Stanze. "They were the treasure chambers from which were taken

Paul, he says: "On ne peut rien comparer à cette dernière composition dans le domaine de l'art chrétien."

\* Goethe here insists on the parallel between Raphael and Michael Angelo (see *supra*, page 298). The tapestries hold a place beside the Creation of Michael Angelo. Raphael has achieved this "by avoiding any competition with Michael Angelo in the field of dramatic pathos, and by aiming at greatness of style and loftiness of expression within the limits of a restful beauty." (ROSENBERG, Raffael, Stuttgart, 1904, XXXI.).

† Cf. E. V. STEINLE, Briefwechsel, I., 161.

‡ STRZYGOWSKI, 50 *seq.*, 62 *seq.*, 83 *seq.* Cf. also SCHADEN, 176 *seq.*; SPRINGER, 288 *seq.*; and GRIMM, Leben Raphaels, 389.

the types of expression of human emotion, and Raphael's reputation as a draughtsman rests mainly on these works. Western art has had no other pattern for the expressions of wonder and fear, of anguish and dignity, on the human countenance."\* The sublimity of the subjects, than which none more befitting the private chapel of the Pope could have been chosen, corresponded to that of their artistic treatment. Michael Angelo had painted on the ceiling the creation and primæval history of mankind up to the Flood, along with Prophets and Sibyls as heralds of the New Covenant. The masters of the "Quattrocento" had displayed on the intermediate walls the period of the Law as represented in the life of Moses, and the kingdom of grace as represented in that of Christ. This kingdom was to endure to the end of the ages. Raphael, therefore, determined to continue in his tapestries the history of our salvation, which began with the creation of the world, by portraying the institution of the Primacy and the life of the early church as illustrated by the Acts of the Apostles. The spectator is thus expressly reminded that he is standing in the central spot in Christendom, in the private sanctuary of the Church's head. The wondrous deeds of the Princes of the Apostles, who hallowed Rome by their martyrdoms, the call of the one to be chief ruler, of the other to worldwide apostolic labours—this is the theme of his immortal work. Under Leo X., in the Papal Chapel, the Roman Church, as the way of salvation, in the persons of her two most prominent representatives, St. Peter the Prince of the Apostle and the first Pope, and St. Paul the Apostle

\* WÖLFFLIN, 105. Among the opinions of modern artists, besides those given by MÜNTZ (*Tapisseries*, 19 *seq.*), those of OVERBECK (*Letter in the Allgem. konservat. Monatschrift.*, 1888, I., 41 *seq.*) and E. v. STEINLE (*Leben und Briefwechsel*, I., 161, 208).



of the Gentiles, has been glorified in the golden letters of consummate art.

Along with the frescoes in the Stanze and the tapestries, ranks yet a third not less remarkable work, which Leo undertook for the adornment of the Vatican, namely, the Loggie. Each of the three stories of the Vatican opens on to a row of arcades. The middle one of these in the eastern wing has gained world-wide renown under the name of Raphael's Loggie. It rightly forms, along with the Sixtine Chapel and the Stanze, one of the greatest attractions for all travellers in Rome. The building of this beautiful apartment was begun by Bramante, and continued, after his death, by Raphael. The date, 1513, in the twelfth arcade of the Loggie, indicates the beginning of a work which, at the latest, was ended in 1518. More precise information about the history of the building is lacking.\* The Papal accounts for August and September, 1518, afford a certain amount of data as regards the laying of the floor.† This consisted of costly slabs of majolica from the Florentine workshops of the Della Robbia, whose emblem was displayed upon them on a carpet pattern.‡

\* Cf. REUMONT, III., 2, 402 ; GEYMÜLLER, Raffaello, 48 *seq.* (p. 49, read 1518 for 1517). Cf. *Projets primitifs*, 75 *seq.*

† MÜNTZ, Raphaël, 452.

‡ Cf. TESORONE, *L'antico pavimento delle Logge di Raffaello*, Napoli, 1891, and GNOLI in *Arch. stor. d. Arte*, IV. (1891), 205 *seq.* Both students were unaware that an old and very good drawing of the pavement is to be found in the *\*Disegni della prima e seconda loggia Vaticana fatti da Francesco La Vega Spagnolo, l' a° 1745, per ordine e spese dell' em. sig. Card. Silvio Valenti Gonzaga, segret. di stato della S<sup>ta</sup> di Benedetto XIV., e dall, em. nipote di lui sig. card. Luigi, Bibliotecario di S. C. e protettore della biblioteca Vaticana donati a questa l' a° 1802, nel giorno med° nel quale n'ebbe il solenne possesso (Sala d. stampe e incis. AMD, XVI., I., Vatican Library) on table 57. Of the original pavement here shown, some remains have been pre-*

The execution of the richly carved doors, ornamented with the arms of the Médici, was entrusted to Giovanni Barile of Siena.

We are sadly in want of detailed information about the origin of the decorations with which the walls, pillars, and ceilings of the Loggie are filled. When these works were begun is still a matter of uncertainty. One thing only is certain, that the completion of this noble piece of decoration was brought about all too soon.\* This, according to authentic sources, was in the summer of 1519. The account books mention, on the 11th of June of that year, a sum of twenty-five ducats paid to Raphael's assistants who had painted in the Loggie.† A few days later, on the 16th of June, 1519, Baldassare Castiglione wrote to the Marchioness Isabella d'Este: "The Pope takes more pleasure than ever in music and architectural works. He continues to erect new buildings in the Vatican; a Loggia has just been finished there, and painted and ornamented with stucco after antique designs; it is a work of Raphael, and is as beautiful as anything can well be, and is perhaps a more perfect piece of work than anything that we can show at the present time."‡ In agreement with this

served and set up in the Appartamento Borgia by Professor Seits; the rest was so injured by wear and tear that in 1869 it was replaced by a new pavement made of large marble slabs. Now that the manufacture of majolica is restored, it is to be wished that a copy of the old flooring might be made to take the place of the present marble one, which is not in keeping with the decoration of the walls and ceiling. For another drawing of the pavement in a manuscript in the Court Library of Vienna, see *infra*, p. 324 n.

\* Namely, 1518. So GRUYER, 203, and many others.

† ZAHN in Arch. stor. Ital., 3rd Series, VI., 1, 188.

‡ This important evidence was published in the periodical Il Raffaello, from Sept. 20 to Sept. 30, 1876. As this review is no longer in circulation, I give the passage: "Dil resto si vive al consueto. N S<sup>re</sup>

account are various letters of the Venetian Marcantonio Michiel. On the 4th of May, 1519, he reports that Raphael has completed the painting of a very long Loggia, and is making preparations for the work on two others.\* On the 27th of December, Michiel returns to the subject again: "The undermost Loggia of the Vatican," he says in a despatch which is as interesting as it is important, "has just been finished.† It is adorned with stucco work, grotesques, and similar designs; the work has not been carried out with great finish, for not much money has been spent upon it; yet it is pleasing to the eye. The reason why this arcade has been sparingly treated is that it is open to all the inmates of the Palace; even persons on horseback use it, although this Loggia is on the first story. The one above is very differently treated; it is closed, and can only be opened by the Pope's permission. It contains pictures of high value and great charm, which have only just been finished, and for which Raphael drew the sketches. The Pope besides has brought hither a number of antique statues which were before kept in the private apartments, and were bought partly by himself and partly by Julius II. They are set up in niches between the windows, which face the columns of the gallery, immediately alongside of the Papal apartments and the Hall of the Consistory."‡

sta su la musica più che mai et di varie sorti si diletta ancor de architettura e va sempre facendo qualche cosa nova in questo palazzo et or si è fornito una loggia dipinta e lavorata de' stucchi alla antica, opera di Raffaello, bello al possibile e forse piu che cosa che si vegga oggidi de moderni." *Gonzaga Archives, Mantua.*

\* CICOONA, 401.

† On the first story. The paintings and decorations (*cf.* TALA, *Descriz. del Vaticano*, 124 *segg.*) unfortunately show strong marks of restoration.

‡ CICOONA, 406-407.



As an approach to the Stanze, or state apartments of the Pope, the Loggia of the second story, with its thirteen bays, was adorned with all that the then existing art could supply. Not only on the small, dome-shaped ceilings, but on all other surfaces of the arcade, which originally were open\* and were permeated by the clearest light, was lavished a decoration in which sculpture and painting were combined in a way never since repeated. The spirit of the Leonine age is here conspicuously illustrated by the brightness and splendour of the whole, and by the free intermixture of Christian and pagan subjects. The Biblical pictures on the ceilings have a character well befitting the palace of the chief ruler of the Church; the decorations on the walls recall the Pope who was hardly surpassed by any of his predecessors in his love for the study of antiquity.

The scheme of decoration comprised in the thirteen shallow domes of the roof is carried out on a strong and simple plan. The ceiling of the seventh dome, as the central point of the whole, is rendered conspicuous by rich adornments of stucco, in the centre of which is the large armorial blazon of Leo X. In the rest of the ceilings the key-stone is formed by the devices of the Medici placed alternately and in pairs—the diamond ring with the three coloured ostrich feathers, and the yoke, which are upheld by figures of winged genii.†

\* The glass windows were put in in 1813, at the instigation of the Neapolitan Minister, G. Zurlo; see the periodical, *Muratori*, I, 266 *seq.*

† Likewise, as STEINMANN (*Rom*, 201) points out, “the co-ordination and decoration of the cupolas is carried out in couples, the same designs and patterns being repeated in each pair. In the first pair of ceilings bright-coloured tapestries are spread out between the sacred pictures; in the second a very artistic perspective drawing, with pillars and architectural detail, is introduced, with the deep blue sky appearing



Each dome is adorned with four small frescoes, those in the central arcade having frames of stucco, while the others have painted borders. Forty-eight of these are of subjects drawn from the Old Testament, while four are from the New; they are well known under the name of Raphael's Bible. There has been keen controversy as to his share in the entire work.\* Vasari states that "Raphael made the drawings for the stucco ornamentation, and for the pictures, which were to be painted in the Loggie; Giovanni da Udine he set over the stucco work and the grotesques, and Giulio Romano over the figures, although the latter did little thereto. Besides them, Giovanni Francesco Penni,

through the roof and windows. In the third and fifth ceilings rich grotesques and imitation mosaics surround the paintings, while in the fourth the architectural design is repeated, and again in the sixth. At the beginning and end of the series a net or trellis appears to be flung over the roof, in the interstices of which innumerable angels hover." The motto *Semper*, in conjunction with the three ostrich feathers in a diamond ring, was long the favourite device of the Medici. It is a symbolical representation of the legend *Semper adamas* (=diamond; but also=unbent) *in poenis* (pennis). See FABRICZY in Repert. für Kunstwissenschaft., XI., 309. Cf. also TAIA, Descriz. del Vaticano, 128.

\* Thorough descriptions of the Loggie are given by BUNSEN-PLATNER, II., I., 308 *seq.*; PASSAVANT, II., 219 *seq.* (at p. 206 *seq.* is a drawing of copper-work); GRUYER, 23-194; FÖRSTER, II., 108 *seq.*; CROWE-CAVALCASELLE, II., 405 *seq.* The work of REIFFENBERG, *Études sur les Loges de Raphaël*, published in Brussels in 1845, is a plagiarism; see E. DE BUSSCHER, *Études des études de M. de Reiffenberg*, Gand, 1846. Cf. also PICOT in *Cabinet de l'Amateur*, IV., 123 *seq.* Koch's photographs of Raphael's Loggie, published at Vienna, 1878, are founded on the often inaccurate plates of Ottaviani and Volpato. LETAROUILLY, Vatican, II., devotes forty-seven plates to the Loggie of the Court of S. Damasus, forty-two of which show the Loggie of Raphael, partly in colours. Cf. also GRUNER, *Fresco Decorations and Stuccos*; new edit., London, 1854. A publication, with all the help of modern technical appliances, is needed. HÖFLER, Adrian VI., 498.

Tommaso Vincidor of Bologna, Perino del Vaga, Pellegrino da Modena, Vincenzo da San Gimignano, Polidoro da Caravaggio, and many others painted these figures, pictures, and other objects."\* Although the execution is here ascribed entirely to his pupils, Raphael's designs are pronounced by Vasari to be the basis of their compositions, and with this the testimony of Michiel, as well as that of the connoisseur Castiglione, is in agreement.

A critical examination of the sketches relating to the pictures in the Loggie certainly gives the result that of the great number of these drawings none are by Raphael, and, with the exception of the original sketch preserved in the Uffizi, of Penni's "Joseph cast into the Well by his Brethren," none belong to his pupils. They are evidently all copies made at a later date from the frescoes which had already become famous. The attempt to establish from the frescoes themselves the hand of the original artist meets with the greatest difficulties, many having been restored and others being in such bad preservation that only a close examination of the forms could lead to further results. The outcome of these investigations is that the paintings of the first nine domes are, with the exception of the landscapes and animal studies of Giovanni da Udine, to be attributed to Penni, those of the last four to other artists, especially Perino del Vaga. Raphael, according to this view, only contributed "the most general ideas for the compositions," and his share in the entire decoration of the Loggie only amounted to this, that he laid before Giovanni da Udine the general plan, and gave his approval to the details as they were brought before him."† Against

\* See DOLLMAYR, 283.

† DOLLMAYR, 297, 309. In another place (300) Dollmayr says that Raphael gave instructions to his pupils orally, and, at the utmost, only drew slight sketches.

such an hypothesis weighty objections have been urged. Among other questions it has been asked: "How, if Giovanni da Udine worked from his own plan and in entire independence, are we to explain Raphael's relation to the Pope, who had committed the undertaking to him? In a work begun in his own name, and for which he had received payment, he must at least have had some personal concern." \* Nor are there wanting investigators at the present day who still uphold the old view that Raphael's participation, at least in the designs for the Loggie decorations, was very thorough. As regards the pictures on the ceilings in particular, they are convinced that certainly those in the first eight arcades are the genuine work of the master, but also that his share in the pictures of the remaining arcades, up to the tenth, was predominant even in matters of detail. † That the execution of the frescoes was carried out by his pupils, admits of no doubt; we must forget the harsh colouring, the brick-red flesh tints, the crude combination of colours, in order to enjoy the beauty of the original drawing. ‡

\* WEESE in *Repert. für Kunstwissenschaft.*, XIX., 372. MÜNTZ controverts Dollmayr still more strongly in the *Athenaeum*, July, 1896, 72 *seq.*

† STEINMANN, *Rom*, 202, among more recent writers, has given special support to this view. Also ZIMMERMANN, II., 486: "Raphael's guidance, even in details, in this series of pictures, cannot be called in question." C. V. FABRICZY observes, in the *Allgem. Zeitung*, 1903, *Beil.* 160, p. 111: "Even if, as has recently been done, we give Raphael's pupils the credit not only for the material execution of the work, but also for the composition of the details, yet the creative spirit of the whole conception and the ideas which permeate and give shape to the execution must assuredly be referred to the master."

‡ In the present deplorable condition of the Loggie the old copies are of special value. Besides the great \**Work of Franc. La Vega* (Vatican Library) already quoted, which contains 59 finely executed

The bright little pictures in the cupolas of the Loggie are in an essentially different style from the colossal and solemn illustrations of holy writ with which Michael Angelo has adorned the roof of the Sixtine Chapel. At the same time many of the former show Michael Angelo's influence. No one could escape the spell of this Titan of the Renaissance. The picture of the Creation in the first, and that of the Flood in the third arcade are borrowed directly from Michael Angelo. The Banishment from Paradise in the second arcade is simply a replica of Masaccio's unequalled rendering of that subject. The lovely landscape in the Jacob and Rachel at the Well is a copy from a copper-plate of Dürer,\* and the Adam of the Fall of an antique figure.† At the same time the Loggie display very many representations of the highest originality. The lives of the Patriarchs, Abraham prostrate before the Three Angels, Jacob and Rachel at the Well, the Finding of Moses, Joseph interpreting his Dreams,

folio engravings, a codex in the Court Library, Vienna, Min. 33, here calls for special notice: "*Peintures à gouache faites à Rome par de jeunes artistes les plus renommés qui étaient à Rome du temps de M. Giov. Batt. Armenini pour un Fugger*"; this contains 105 folio pages of consummate workmanship. The Loggie can here be studied better than in the original, and still better than in any of the publications that have hitherto appeared. Some of the plates are of exceptional beauty. Of the Viennese MS. ARMENINI, *De' veri precetti della pittura* (ed. Milano, 1820), 270, observes: "*Et è certo che ogni cosa di questa insieme col suo pavimento fu disegnato e colorito in carta a uso di minio nel proprio modo che si trova per mano di piu valenti giovani che in Roma fossero nel mio tempo fra le quali io ne feci parte, onde così colorita fu poi mandata di chi l'avea in commissione e che la pagava realmente in Aversa a un gran signore de Fucheri, il quale si dice che di ciò si diletta sopra modo.*" A second copy was sent to Spain to Philip II.

\* Strzygowski also calls attention to this.

† See AMELUNG in *Strenna Helbigiana*, Lipsiae, 1900, 8.



are compositions which stand alone in their attractive beauty and deep poetry. They are thoroughly human and yet highly idealized. It is matter for ever-renewed wonder that, by means of a few figures, the narrative should be here portrayed with such entire simplicity and at the same time with such fidelity to life.\* Raphael must certainly have greatly influenced these remarkable compositions. On the other hand, the touch of Giovanni da Udine is perceptible throughout the landscape backgrounds with their sunlight charm; they enhance to no small degree the idyllic tone of these pictures; this is in harmony both with the character of the biblical stories and with the aim of the compositions which are intended to form only one part of the scheme of decoration.

The first eight arcades have a distinctly different character from the others. In the ninth, certainly, we still find the magnificent Delivery of the Tables of the Law by Moses. But, on the whole, the importance of the pictures begins, at this point, to diminish. The hitherto idyllic character gives place to one that is more dramatic and in keeping with the subjects; the colouring is also brighter and more vivid.† The least successful pictures are in the last or thirteenth arcade, on which the pupils were left to work by themselves.‡ Here the New Testament subjects begin, which were interrupted on the death of Leo X.

In the decorative treatment of the Loggie Raphael took

\* Cf. the striking judgment of MÜNTZ, Raphaël, 453, and BURCKHARDT, Cicerone, 633. See also RIO, Michel-Ange et Raphaël, 208 *seq.*

† Cf. DOLLMAYR, 301.

‡ SPRINGER (331) had already adopted the view that Raphael had no part in this. WOLTMANN (II., 658) sees in the forty compositions of the first ten arcades Raphael's invention. I believe that, with the exception of the one picture specified above, the pupils' work was already practically independent from the ninth arcade onwards.

no great part. Even if glimpses of his genius often break out in this costly series of decorations, yet the inspiring mind, on the whole, must have been that of Giovanni da Udine,\* who had a band of assistants.† Gifted with a rare sense of beauty and inexhaustible fancy, this artist has achieved, in the decoration of the Loggie, a work which is unsurpassed of its kind. Walls, pillars, and archways, and every inch of surface contain, with a classical economy of space, a decoration of gold relieved by colour or a fine white stucco composed by Giovanni da Udine of a mixture of marble and ground chalk. Perhaps the chief charm of these decorations, their magical play of iridescent colours, varied but harmonious, is now gone beyond recall, since the whole has suffered grievous damage from weather and from the rough hands of many a visitor.‡

The groundwork of the scheme was undoubtedly the antique. In this respect the often-quoted statement of Vasari is incorrect, that the first Roman wall-decorations

\* DOLLMAYR, 302 *seq.*, has established the probability of this, but he goes too far when he here excludes Raphael's influence entirely. On the other side, see BURCKHARDT, Cicerone, 177.

† Thus Perino del Vaga, Pellegrino da Modena, Vicenzio di San Gimignano, and, it may be, Polidoro da Caravaggio. DOLLMAYR, 289.

‡ In any case the fate of the wall decorations has been more fortunate than that of the ceilings, since the former have escaped tasteless restorations. The work undertaken by Professor L. Seitz, from 1890 to 1891, was restricted to the preservation of the existing decorations and the removal of certain extraneous details which had, in some unaccountable way, been introduced into the original scheme. This has been done without touching the old paintings or supplementing the damaged stucco work. Where portions of the latter are wanting they have been replaced by a light wash in chiaro-oscuro, and where detached from the wall they have been refastened by means of metal appliances. A thorough study of the Loggie is now only possible with the aid of copper-plate engravings, or, better still, of ancient copies.

to be discovered were those in the so-called Baths of Titus, and that Giovanni da Udine was the first to copy them. Already, since the last quarter of the 15th century, the artists of the Renaissance knew and made use of the graceful designs in painting and stucco to be seen on the ceilings of the underground ancient buildings in Rome, which at the present day are pointed out as "grottoes," from whence the term grotesque has been derived.\* It is to the credit of Giovanni da Udine that he gave a thoroughly original turn to this kind of decoration and brought it to a pitch of classical perfection. Taken as a whole, he has achieved his task in an entirely new and independent style. "The essential feature, the ascending series of decorations on the pillars, is wanting in the earlier antique examples."† A detailed description of this splendid outcome of the taste and sense of beauty of the Leonine age would be beyond the power of even the most skilful pen. The whole is like a book of fairy tales in colours and pictures, a dreamland of inimitable poesy—on all sides the most graceful figures and ornaments are lavished on the walls and pillars, yet without superfluity. Painting and stucco work follow each other in unending variety. Everywhere the eye falls on attractive and graceful pictures which are deftly and without effort adapted to the architectural or decorative scheme of the building.

Although the artist had an absolutely free hand in the construction of the Loggie, he yet avoided everything trifling or capricious. The appearance of chance and

\* Cf. SCHMARSOW, *Der Eintritt der Grottesken in die Dekoration der italienischen Kunst*, in *Jahrb. d. preuss. Kunstsamml.*, II., 131 *seq.* See also SPRINGER, 332.

† BURCKHARDT, *Cicerone*, 178. Cf. also the valuable explanations of DOLLMAYR, 302 *seq.*

irregularity in his work is illusory; as a matter of fact, everything is in harmony and proportion. The decoration of each beam has been carried out with the closest regard to symmetrical correspondence with its architectural surroundings.\* Even if the ground-plan is constructed on a consistent principle, yet in the selection of details there is ample freedom. The way in which Giovanni da Udine has here drawn upon nature, as well as antique art, is marvellous; one feature surpasses another in beauty; the beholder is puzzled where first to turn his eyes. No sooner does he seem to have exhausted his survey than some new detail comes to view which once more rivets his attention on this magical fairyland. The tender execution, the naturalistic feeling, the graceful facility, the inexhaustible wealth of artistic imagination and the extraordinary variety of subjects—a variety which is not satisfied with a few illustrations, but borrows from the whole compass of life's prolific resources—all this forms a wondrous combination. Plants in the greatest variety, fruits and animals alternate with imitations of antique sculpture, small landscapes with pleasing fancy figures, allegories with representations of actual life, such as the famous stucco medallions in the window-frame of the first arcade, in which the master is figured sitting and drawing while his pupils carry out his sketches.† On the window-arch of the third arcade the head of Leo X. is also to be seen, while his name appears in many places in the same arcade and on all the windows of the back wall in a way that almost amounts to ostentation. The effect of the exceedingly beautiful garlands of flowers and fruits, which are repeated on the windows between the pillars of the

\* DOLLMAYR, 302 *seq.* See also GRUYER, 155 *seq.*

† The first account of this stucco work was published by KLACZKO, Jules II., 414.



back wall on a sky-blue ground with realistic accuracy, is brilliant.

The decorations contain many allusions to the favourite pursuits of Leo X. Music is symbolized by many representations of instruments; fishes, birds, and other animals recall the Pope's passion for the chase; even the elephant is twice depicted. In between these are everywhere lovely designs in spirals, scrolls, and garlands. Humorous pieces, such as winged infants in swaddling bands, cupids teaching a bear to dance, are to be found, no less than reminiscences of contemporary works of art, such as Raphael's *Jonas*. Nor are Christian emblems wanting in this motley scene, although they almost disappear amid the copious array of imagery drawn directly from ancient sources or conceived in their spirit. The greater portion of classical antiquity here awakes again to life: we see the Victory of Trajan's Column, the Apollo Belvedere, the Venus Victrix, Jupiter, Bacchus and Ariadne, Apollo and Marsyas, Diana of Ephesus, Medæa on her Dragon Car, Ægistheus and Orestes, sphinxes, centaurs, satyrs, the Three Graces, dancing girls, minstrel maidens beating tambourines, nymphs, heroes, harpies, cupids at play, Tritons joining battle with sea-monsters, sacrificial rites, augurs taking auspices, ruins and temples half gone to decay, the Appian Way, the Tomb of Cecilia Metella, the Walls of Rome.\*

The partiality of Leo X. for ancient art has been made matter of heavy censure; even the paintings of "Raphael's Bible" have been described as an insincere performance, the subjects represented having long lost their religious significance.† Such a verdict is unjust both to the character

\* Cf. BUNSEN-PLATNER, II., 304. PULSZKY, *Raffaëls Studium der Antike*, Leipzig, 1877, 27 *seq.*

† RUMOHR, *Forschungen*, III., 124. CARTIER, *De l'art chrétien*,

of the Renaissance and to the personal views of Leo X. If we consider the purpose which the Loggie were intended to serve, there is nothing incongruous in the introduction of subjects drawn from the ancient world. The robust Julius II. found his recreation in the gardens of the Belvedere, adorned with the masterpieces of antiquity; Leo X., infirm and ailing, sought enjoyment in the contemplation of his collections in the sheltered enclosure of the Loggie. That Christian and heathen art should meet on peaceable terms, such as the Loggie bear witness to, caused not the slightest affront to anyone in that flowering time of humanism. Such an alliance had for long been a matter of daily occurrence in painting and sculpture as well as in poetry.\* If the opinion of a later age was less lenient, it must still be recalled to mind that the early Christians themselves, in the decorations of the Catacombs, took pleasure in works handed down to them from a yet older world. As a matter of fact, any unseemly representations† in the decorations of the Loggie are quite isolated and unobtrusive. Even an uncompromising critic has justly remarked, in this connection, that the more closely the churches were shut against the lighter efforts of pagan imagination, the more widely might the doors of palaces be thrown open to receive them.‡

Although the pagan type preponderates in the decorations of the Loggie, religious subjects are yet to be found there. On the pillars between the second and third arcade the expulsion from Paradise is represented on one

Paris, 1875, 90, speaks of the pagan details in the Loggie as exaggerated and ill-drawn, which is perhaps not to be wondered at in a writer who finds fault even with the Transfiguration.

\* Cf. Vol. I. of this work, 360, and Vol. V., 143.

† Leda and an Hermaphrodite.

‡ BEISSEL in the *Stimmen aus Maria-Laach*, LIII. (1897), 544 *seq.*

relief, and on another the Pope bestowing his benediction. Along with the biblical pictures on the ceilings, the decorations, which in each arcade are carried out in duplicates of the same designs and patterns, several religious subjects are treated in harmony with the frescoes. Thus angels praying surround the pictures of the Creation and the Incarnation in the first and last arcade. Sometimes even the mythological designs contain thoughtful suggestions of the biblical pictures to which they are thus made subordinate.\* The bronze-tinted pictures on the brackets, executed by Perino del Vaga, are all taken from biblical subjects relating to the pictures on the cupolas.† It is impossible therefore to assert that the decorations of the Loggie have not the slightest connection, in spirit, with the scriptural paintings in the cupolas.‡ On the contrary, we must suppose that, in accordance with the spirit of the age and with that of Raphael himself, there was a definite correspondence between the two. In the frescoes in the Stanze, the apartments of the head of Christendom, the painter has emphasized in an incomparable way the supremacy of the Church over the heathen world.§ In the adjoining Loggie, destined to exhibit the noteworthy relics of

\* Cf. further PASSAVANT, I., 269. See also FÖRSTER, II., 108 *seq.*; GRUYER, 192; and PIPER, 296, 367.

† Unfortunately these lower portions of the Loggie are completely destroyed, so that we must have recourse to the plates of Bartoli. The interesting anecdote of Raphael's jealousy, in the Letter of Pandolfo Pico della Mirandola, January 29, 1520 (in BERTOLETTI, *Artisti in relaz. coi Gonzaga*, 155), refers apparently to Perino del Vaga, who also worked in Rome for the Fuggers (SCHULTE, I., 207). Cf. LERMOLIEFF, *Die Galerien Borghese*, 188 *seq.*, and LUZIO-RENIER, 234

‡ BURCKHARDT, *Cicerone*, 674.

§ Cf. Vol. VI. of this work, 559, 584-589.

antiquity, the same idea has been expressed with a lighter and more delicate touch; above the beauties of ancient statuary with which the walls and pillars harmonize in their adornment, hover the scenes of higher import described in the sacred Scriptures.

A similar work of decoration to that in the Loggie was carried out by Raphael's pupils, Perino del Vaga and Giovanni da Udine, on the ceiling of the great Papal Hall in the Borgia apartments. At the present day the visitor can still see in their radiant brightness the paintings and stucco work of both these artists. The former has here portrayed the starry firmament with allegorical features, while Giovanni da Udine executed the charming framework consisting of white and gold stucco ornaments on a sky-blue background. The name and the armorial bearings of Leo X. appear everywhere; in between, one reads with interest a series of inscriptions relating to the history of the Popes from Urban II. to Martin V.; they are apparently all that remain to remind one of paintings that had a place here at some earlier date.\*

The paintings of Raphael for the Hall of the Palefrenieri and the corridor leading to the Belvedere have perished. The former was entirely painted over by Taddeo Zuccherò; the corridor was destroyed under Clement VII.†

How Raphael was able, concurrently with all these tasks, to find time for the commissions of Cardinal Bibbiena, of Agostino Chigi,‡ and for a long series of panel pictures, portraits, and religious subjects, remains a wonder; it is certain that he made large demands on the assistance of his pupils. In the famous picture of Leo X. itself, the head

\* See STEINMANN in the *Kunstchronik*, 1899, 357.

† Cf. MÜNTZ, *Raphaël*, 465 *seq.*, and *Gaz. d. Beaux-Arts*, XX. (1879), 183.

‡ Cf. *supra*, pp. 112, 119.



and hands only can be set down to the master.\* It is undeniable that his pupils took a large share not only in the execution but in the sketch of the two great pictures, the Holy Family and the Archangel St. Michael, which Lorenzo de' Medici presented in 1518 to the French royal family.† On the other hand, he produced single-handed the great altar-piece of the Sixtine Madonna, and the sketch of the Transfiguration, in which he has celebrated, with wondrous art, mysteries of the Christian faith. Both these immortal works, which rank among the most beautiful pictures on earth, reveal the touch of a visionary. Already in the Madonna di Foligno, in the Ezekiel, and the St. Cecilia this note had been struck, but here it reaches the highest pitch.

The Sixtine Madonna, intended for the Benedictine Church of San Sisto in Piacenza, was probably contemporaneous with the tapestry cartoons. Wonder is there glorified, and, like a marvellous apparition, the Queen of Heaven soars above the clouds, unapproachable in her majesty, holding her Divine Child in her arms, amid the splendour of an aureole formed of thousands of angel-heads; on either side kneel St. Barbara and the aged Pope Sixtus, while below, rounding off the composition, is the famous group of angels. Few indeed are the works of art from the hand of man in which there dwells such sublimity and unearthly consecration; among all the pictures of Mary, none is so widely known, be it in palace or in cottage. Painters of the first rank have attempted to reproduce the beauties of this incomparable creation. This one picture has given rise to a copious literature, so inexhaustible are the points of view which

\* Cf. SPRINGER, 255, and ZIMMERMANN, II., 488 *seq.*

† See GAYE, II., 146 *seq.*; Atti Mod., I., 117; ZIMMERMANN, II., 490.

it presents.\* It is one of the few sacred pictures which bring home to the beholder at once, as if by some miraculous power, the conviction of supernatural truths surpassing human understanding. As he looks he is drawn towards another and a higher world, and he is forced to acknowledge, with humility, the reality of eternal things. The attitude of Pope Sixtus and of St. Barbara expresses this in the most forcible way.† The Pope has laid aside his triple crown, and bends the knee in worship to the Queen of Heaven, while he commends to her the company of the faithful on earth. St. Barbara in her lowliness durst not raise her eyes. In her blessedness she reverences the Mother of God, who, despite her exceeding glory, appears only as the guardian of the Eternal Child, who came in poverty and nakedness into the world.

On this canvas Raphael has surpassed himself; the mother of our Lord, encompassed by light and descending from the heights of heaven, seems indeed to manifest to mankind the great mystery of the Eternal Word made flesh. The supernatural impression which permeates the whole picture is produced above all by the movement of the principal figure, who seems to be descending from heaven to earth, and by the expression which beams from her radiant eyes, and from those of her Son, and cannot be adequately conveyed by any verbal description. The

\* The bibliography in MÜNTZ, *Historiens*, 95 *seq.*, is incomplete. Cf. FRANZ, II., 750 *seq.*, the acute remarks of WÖLFFLIN, 128 *seq.*, and STRZYGOWSKI, 65 *seq.*, where further literary references are given. For the fate of the picture and its purchase for the Dresden Gallery, see *Repert.*, VII., 163 *seq.*, and XXIII., 12 *seq.* Cf. also VENTURI, *La Madonna*, Milano, 1900.

† See PORTIG, *Die Sixtinische Madonna*, Leipzig, 1882, 31 *seq.* Cf. KEPPLER'S masterly article in the *Histor.-polit. Bl.* XCIV., 81 *seq.*

gaze of Mary passes far beyond the spectator into a world of deep contemplation and wonder; before her, one by one, the secrets of the coming ages seem to be unrolled. "Pondering all these things in her heart," she broods over the prediction of the aged Simeon, that her Son would be the "light of the Gentiles, the glory of his own people, set for the fall and resurrection of many; a sign that should be contradicted" (Luke ii. 19, 32-35). Simeon's prophecy that the heart of the Mother of God should be burdened with heavy sorrows—"and a sword shall pierce thine heart also"—has been indicated by Raphael in the unmistakable expression of sorrow imprinted on the countenance of Mary.\* The countenance of the Child also is one of deep thought, but not of wonder. In all the consciousness of His Godhead, the divine Babe, whose form and features, especially the eyes, surpass mortal proportions, gazes fixedly and peacefully into infinite depths. He does not sit, He is enthroned in His mother's arms, who displays to the world, with reverence and awe, the great gift committed to her charge; and yet the vision is not for long, for at any moment this picture "from the heights of heaven" may vanish thither again.

The representation of an actual vision was Raphael's last creation. This was the picture of Christ's Transfiguration on Mount Tabor, ordered by Cardinal Medici for his cathedral church at Narbonne.† On the mountain

\* Cf., along with PORTIG, 26, 33 *seq.*, HEUCKING (Die Sixtinische Madonna, Petersburg, 1862), KEPPLER, *loc. cit.*, and BRUNN in the Deutschen Rundschau, XII., 42 *seq.*, 48.

† That Raphael's last picture might be preserved to Rome, Cardinal Medici sent it, in 1524, to the Church of S. Pietro in Montorio (*cf.* Arch. stor. d. Arte, I., 449). Thence it was conveyed to Paris by the French; and from Paris, in 1815, it was brought back to Rome to the picture gallery of the Vatican.

top the Saviour hovers in a blaze of divine glory, surrounded by a white and dazzling brightness like an apparition of light: "his face did shine like the sun, and his garments became white as snow" (Matt. xvii. 2). Seldom has the difficulty of depicting the spontaneous upward flight of a human body been solved so beautifully and naturally as here. On this figure of Christ Raphael has concentrated the whole force of his manifold powers; every chord of his artist's soul vibrates in one full harmony. Unspeakable gentleness and majesty, such as the glorified Mediator between God and man alone could possess, are written on the countenance, which is slightly turned to one side. The eyes and arms are uplifted to heaven as if expressing the unappeasable longing for that return to the Father's house which He can only earn as the reward of His Passion. On a somewhat lower level but beside Him hover, in attitudes of deepest awe, Moses the Lawgiver, clasping the two Tables to his breast, and Elias, the most glorious of the Prophets, holding the book of his prophecies; drawn to the Saviour as by a magnet, circling like planets round their sun, they yet approach only to the edge of the radiance which encompasses the transfigured One. The Lord is the source of light as of power. He alone, as the light-giver, is clad in raiment of snowy whiteness; the garments of the Lawgiver and the Prophet are suffused with hues of yellow and violet.\* The glory of Moses and Elias is borrowed from the divine light. The chosen disciples, Peter, James, and John, have, on the other hand, sunk down dazed and terror-stricken on the level of the mountain summit; on the left kneel two martyr deacons, figures of smaller stature than the disciples; these again are less than Moses and Elias. While exalted above

\* Cf. SPRINGER, 361; JUSTI, *Die Verklärung Christi*, 1870, 30 *seq.*; GRIMM, *Leben Raphael's*, 469 *seq.*; WÖLFFLIN, 131 *seq.*



space and time, the Redeemer, as He rises towards heaven, looms in yet vaster proportions.

At the foot of the mountain is enacted the episode of the lunatic boy whom the disciples were unable to heal, a scene which St. Matthew (xvii. 14 *seq.*) connects with the Transfiguration.\* The contrast is the strongest conceivable, and is all the more sharply felt as this part of the picture was executed by Giulio Romano, not to the advantage of the whole. Round the wretched boy in his convulsions have gathered his relations and the disciples; many of these figures directly recall Leonardo da Vinci.† Their expressions and gestures reflect compassion, astonishment, distraction, helplessness, doubt; but amid the general confusion some of the disciples are pointing up to the mountain whither He has betaken Himself who alone can bring help. In accordance with the painter's intention, these see the transfigured Jesus just as little as the rest of the crowd below. He is only visible to the beholder of the picture, and thus the spiritual unity is restored.‡ Below are the miseries and sorrows of the helpless children of earth; above, the undisturbed blessedness of the transfigured Lord, the Almighty Power which alone can heal and succour.

Such a reference to Christ as the deliverer from every, even the greatest necessity, was, at the time when this mystic creation of Raphael was finished, eminently

\* The close connection is indicated just at this point by the introduction of a piece of water on the left of the canvas, a feature which is omitted in all descriptions of the picture.

† STRZYGOWSKI, 73 *seq.*

‡ WOLTMANN, II., 671; STRZYGOWSKI, 72 *seq.* Cf. also HAGEN, Briefe in Die Heimat, II., Berlin, 1818, 346; SCHLEGEL, Werke, VI., 54 *seq.*; THIERSCH, A v. Schaden, Frankfurt, 1853, 139, 142 *seq.*; HASSE, Kunststudien, III.; Der Verklärung Christi, Breslau, 1889, 17 *seq.*; and Deutsche Literaturztg, 1893, 463 *seq.*

appropriate to existing circumstances. The reports of the encroachments of the infidels had not for long been so alarming, so that in the autumn of 1517 the Turkish question stood in the forefront of public interest at Rome. "The Pope," wrote Cardinal Medici, who had commissioned the Transfiguration, at the end of October to the Nuncio in Venice, "is occupied with Eastern affairs at the present moment more than with any other matters." Soon after this Leo addressed a detailed memorial to the chief princes of Christendom, who were to communicate to him their views on the war with the Turks. The deliberations which ensued were followed in the spring of 1518 by the proclamation of a general armistice throughout Christendom, and the decision to despatch Legates to arrange for a Crusade. At the same time a great procession with prayers took place in Rome, the Pope in person taking part in it. Raphael was a witness of this great religious demonstration, during which his friend Sadoletto delivered an oration which was greatly admired.\*

The picture of the Transfiguration had a close connection with these efforts of the Roman See to promote the Crusade. Calixtus III., on the occasion of the great victory over the Turks at Belgrade, in 1456, had expressly commanded that the festival of the Transfiguration should henceforward be kept annually on the 6th of August throughout Christendom, in thanksgiving for this signal success. "The liturgical Feast of the Transfiguration was thus turned into the anniversary of the victory of Western Christendom over the Crescent, and the glory of Christ on Mount Tabor became a triumphal mystery as well as a token of the downfall of the Church's hereditary foe." This accounts for the introduction of the two martyr deacons, by whom Felicissimus and Agapitus only can be meant—saints whose commemora-

\* Cf. Vol. VII. of this work, pp. 222 *seq.*, 226 *seq.*, 233 *seq.*

tion at the altar stands in close relationship to the Feast of the Transfiguration. This connection was in Raphael's days a matter of present recollection, so that no one at the Court of Leo X. could feel any doubt as to the real meaning of the painter; it would inspire confidence and give believers the assurance that even amid the existing dangers the all-powerful aid of Christ would not fail them against the enemies of the Christian name.\* It was given to Raphael to finish only the upper half of the picture; in the last week of March, 1520, he fell ill of one of the dangerous Roman fevers, and this rapidly consumed the forces which had been already weakened by labours beyond the common strength of man. On Good Friday (April 6) his soul passed to that other world of which he had portrayed transcendant glimpses in his pictures. At the head of his bier was placed his unfinished masterpiece, the Transfiguration.

The impression caused by the almost sudden demise of one who had only reached his thirty-seventh year, and stood in the midway of his famous career, was intense; he had just bought a site, in the Via Giulia, near the Church of S. Giovanni dei Fiorentini, for the construction of a new

\* FR. SCHNEIDER (*Theologisches zu Raffael*, Mainz, 1896, 11 *seq.*), in explaining the introduction of the Martyr deacons and the connection between the contents of the picture and the festival of the Transfiguration, has made a most happy discovery. Among other things he calls attention to the circumstance that Narbonne, the picture's place of destination, was then much exposed to raids from Mahommedan pirates. I am inclined to lay more weight on the crusading efforts of Leo X., already touched upon, of this very year, 1517-18, which are here brought forward for the first time as explanatory of the picture. They complete and confirm Fr. Schneider's explanations thoroughly. The healing of the demoniac boy, taken in connection with the Transfiguration, is, according to his view, a likeness of the frightful bondage of the Mussulman yoke.



palace.\* The irreparable loss was associated in men's minds with the coincidence of an earthquake and the giving way of a part of the Loggie. "The grief at the Papal Court," wrote Pandolfo Pico della Mirandola, "is all the deeper, since still greater works had been expected from the master; nothing else is spoken about throughout Rome than the death of this remarkable man; what is mortal of him has passed away, but his renown can never perish; in his works, and in the admiration of those who survey them, he will live for ever.† As a matter of fact, the most distinguished poets, Bembo, Ariosto, Tebaldeo, and above all the faithful Castiglione, soon became rivals in the celebration of his fame.‡ The opinion was widespread that, had his life been spared longer, he would have reached the greatness of Michael Angelo.§ For his resting-place Raphael had chosen the Pantheon, and had entrusted his friend Lorenzetto with the execution of a statue of Our Lady, which to this day adorns the chapel, to surmount his tomb. The painter who, in his most remarkable creations, had done more than any other to adjust the difficult relations of antique and Christian art, and had in the Sixtine

\* Document of March 24, 1520, in MÜNTZ, 635. Raphael's property was valued at 16,000 ducats; CICOGLIA, 410.

† Pico's letters in *Atti Mod.*, V., 307-308. *Cf.* also the writing of Paolucci, *ibid.*, I., 138, that of Germanello in GAYE, II., 151, and the letters of Lippomano and Michiel in SANUTO, XXVIII., 423 *seq.* These writings refute conclusively the fable of Vasari, already challenged by PUNGILEONI, 257 *seq.*, that Raphael died from debauchery. *Cf.* also, against this assertion, PASSAVANT, II., 555 *seq.*; FARABULINI, Raffaello e la Fornarina, Urbino, 1880; and MINGHETTI, 211 *seq.*, 213.

‡ *Cf.* PASSAVANT, II., 549 *seq.* An unprinted poem of Tebaldeo's was published by CAMPORI in *Atti Mod.*, V., 309. *Cf.* *Gaz. d. Beaux-Arts*, VI., 1872, 365 *seqq.*

§ *Cf.* the verdict of a contemporary, given by JANITSCHKE, in *Reperitorium*, IX., 121.



Madonna depicted the most lovely representation of Mary, could have chosen no more fitting grave than the ancient rotunda which Pope Boniface IV. had transformed into the Church of S. Maria ad Martyres. The burial took place with every circumstance of honour. That the Pope took part in person is a later fable; ceremonially such a mark of distinction was impossible. How greatly Leo sorrowed over the loss of his incomparable friend is clear from the testimony of Marcantonio Michiel, who relates how the Pope sent daily to inquire after Raphael, bestowed upon him many marks of his esteem, and defrayed all the expenses of the funeral.\*

The extraordinary partiality evinced by Leo X. for Raphael and his school had the effect of retarding all other artistic tendencies. Many as were the painters, marked out for distinction, who came to Rome during this Pontificate, not one could secure a footing by the side of Raphael. The most regrettable instance in this respect is that of the painter who, in his Last Supper, had initiated in its most ideal form the age of the high Renaissance. As a young man of six-and-twenty, Leonardo da Vinci, with some of his pupils, had come to Rome in the train of Giuliano de' Medici in the autumn of 1513.† The Pope had conferred on him the marked distinction of placing at his disposal an apartment in the Belvedere; but with the exception of two pictures ordered by Baldassare Turini,

\* CIGOGNA, 409-410. Cf. Repert., IX., 121. For the statue of the Madonna and the opening of the grave on September 9, 1833, see PASSAVANT, II., 558 *seq.* Cf. Nel centenario di Raffaello il Comune di Roma, 1883. For Raphael's skull, of which a plaster-cast was preserved in the Congregazione de' Virtuosi, see Archiv f. Anthropologie, XV., 417 *seq.*; Jahrb. d. preuss. Kunstsamml., VI., 143 *seq.*; GRIMM, Raphael, 493 *seq.*; and SCHAFFHAUSEN, Der Schädel Raffaels, Bonn, 1883.

† RICHTER, II., 441; MÜNTZ, Léonard de Vinci, 454.

Leonardo has left no trace of his art in Rome. Until 1515 he remained in the service of Giuliano de' Medici, who allowed him the handsome salary of thirty-three gold ducats a month;\* but at the end of 1515 he passed into the service of Francis I. What prevented his being attached permanently to Leo X., for whom he wrote a treatise on coinage,† has not yet been explained. Vasari's account is nothing more than an anecdote of the studios. According to this narrative, Leonardo had once received an order to execute for the Pope, but instead of beginning the work, he had spent his time on technical experiments which led to nothing. Thereupon the Pope had remarked that Leonardo would never complete anything, as he busied himself with the end before he took thought for the beginning.‡ It is much more probable that Leonardo, who had also found no employment under Julius II., left Rome on account of unwillingness to be in the same city with Michael Angelo.§

In the year 1514 Fra Bartolommeo came to Rome, attracted by the fame of the works of Raphael and Michael Angelo. Fra Mariano received him hospitably. At the request of the latter he began the pictures of St. Peter and St. Paul, but after a few months returned to Florence.||

\* MÜNTZ, Raphaël, 415, and Léonard de Vinci, 455, 459.

† RICHTER, II., 17-18; *cf.* MÜNTZ, Léonard, 460.

‡ Giovio also states in *L. Vincii Vita* (TIRABOSCHI, VII., 290): "Sed dum in quaerendis pluribus augustae arti adminiculis morosius vacaret, paucissima opera, levitate ingenii naturalique fastidio repudiatis semper initiis absolvit."

§ G. B. DE TONI and G. SOLMI, *Intorno all' andata di Leonardo da Vinci in Francia* (Estr. d. Rendic. d. ist. Ven.), Venezia, 1905, support this thesis. Besides, in 1517, Leonardo was already so ill that no more work on a great scale could be looked for from him. *Cf.* PASTOR, *Reise des Kardinals Luigi d'Aragona*, 79, 143; *cf.* M. HERZFELD, *L. da Vinci*, 2 Aufl., Jena, 1906, CVII. *seq.*

|| FRANZ, *Fra Bartolomeo*, 159-161; DOHME, III., 15-16.

In the same year also Soddoma appeared in Rome, where he executed for Agostino Chigi, on the first story of the Farnesina, the Wedding of Alexander and Roxana and the Family of Darius before Alexander.\* Chigi recommended the painter to the Pope; to the latter he presented the Death of Lucretia, a picture which some modern investigators have claimed to have rediscovered in the Museum in Turin, and others in that of Hanover.† Leo X. bestowed on him in return the honour of knighthood, but Soddoma found as little occupation in the Papal service as Signorelli, who was then in Rome seeking his fortune without success.‡ Andrea del Sarto, Franciabigio, and Pontormo were engaged, according to the accounts of Giovio, in decorating the principal hall in the Villa Poggio at Cajano, near Florence, with historical allegorical subjects from Roman history, which still exist.§

Even Sebastiano del Piombo, the enthusiastic admirer of Michael Angelo, did not succeed in securing the patronage of Leo X.|| Although, in his consuming envy, he left no effort untried to belittle Raphael, his sphere of work never extended beyond private circles; the Pope, to whom the petty dissensions between the partisans of Michael Angelo and those of Raphael

\* Cf. JANSEN, Soddoma, Stuttgart, 1870, 98 *seq.*, 108 *seq.*, 114 *seq.*, and *supra*, p. 119.

† Cf. FRIZZONI, *Arte ital.*, 145-146.

‡ Cf. *Arch. stor. Ital.*, 5th Series, XVII., 126; VISCHER, Signorelli (1879), 110 *seq.*

§ Cf. REUMONT, Andrea del Sarto, 126 *seq.*, and JANITSCHKE, Andrea del Sarto in DOHME, III., 38.

|| Cf. BIAGI, *Mem di F. Sebastiano Luciani*, Venezia, 1826; Dall'Acqua Guisti in the *Atti d. R. Accad. d. Belle Arti di Venezia*, 1870; MILANESI, *Les correspondants de Michel-Ange*, I., Paris, 1890; RICHTER, Sebastiano del Piombo (DOHME, III.), 7 *seq.*; PROPPING, *Seb. del Piombo*, Leipzig, 1892.

were in the highest degree displeasing, remained loyal to the latter. The first-rate paintings which Sebastiano executed in S. Pietro in Montorio were certainly the reason why no less a personage than Cardinal Giulio de' Medici entrusted him with an honourable task. Raphael was invited to paint the Transfiguration at the same time that Piombino was set to work on the Raising of Lazarus. It is easy to imagine with what eagerness the latter seized the opportunity of measuring himself against his hated rival. "My work," he wrote to Michael Angelo on the 2nd of July, 1518, "has been delayed in order that Raphael may not see it until his own is ready." At the end of 1519 Sebastiano sent his painting, which once adorned Cardinal Giulio's archiepiscopal cathedral at Narbonne, and is now one of the ornaments of the National Gallery in London,\* to the Vatican. "It has at once given satisfaction instead of dissatisfaction to everyone, with the exception of the wiseacres who do not as yet know what they ought to say," wrote Sebastiano at that time to Michael Angelo. "I am satisfied, since Cardinal Medici has told me that he has been delighted beyond expectation, and I believe that my picture is better drawn than this tapestry stuff which has come from Flanders."† Leonardo Sallajo believed himself justified in writing to Michael Angelo: "Sebastiano has had such a success with his work that those who know anything about the matter here place him far above Raphael. The ceiling in Agostino Chigi's house is now uncovered; it is a disgrace to a great master, and much worse than the last

\* Thorough description in CROWE-CAVALCASELLE, VI., 385 *seq.*; *cf.* PROPPING, 63 *seq.*

† BOTTARI, VIII., 42; FANFANI, *Spigolature Michelangiolesche*, Pistoia, 1879, 114; GUHL, I., 225. *Cf.* BIAGI, 37; CROWE-CAVALCASELLE, VI., 387.



Stanze in the Vatican. Sebastiano is now relieved from further fear." \*

Since Raphael's death took place while the Transfiguration was yet unfinished, Sebastiano's hopes rose still higher. Now, he believed, the opportunity had come to secure the position of first painter at the Papal Court. His chief ambition was to be entrusted with the decoration of the Hall of Constantine, on which Giulio Romano and Penni had by that time already begun their work; Michael Angelo used all his influence, to this end, with Cardinal Bibbiena. In his letter of introduction, written in June, 1520, he says: "I beg your highness, not as a friend or servant, since neither my friendship nor my service are worthy of you, but as a good-for-nothing crazy wretch, that you will exert yourself to procure for the Venetian painter Sebastiano, now that Raphael is dead, some share in the works at the Vatican. And even if your highness feels ashamed at conferring an obligation on a man of my stamp, yet I think that a kindness done even to a good-for-nothing can give a certain amount of pleasure, just as the palate which has been accustomed to capons can yet relish the taste of onions." † The result of this singular recommendation was that Sebastiano was given the work of painting the "lower hall" in the Appartamento Borgia, where Perino del Vaga and Giovanni da Udine were at work. Such, however, was the infatuation of his artistic conceit, that he declined to paint a "cellar" while Raphael's pupils were permitted to adorn the "treasure chambers." ‡ Nevertheless he persisted in his endeavours, and at last Leo X. granted him an audience.

\* GOTTI, Michelangelo, I., 127.

† MILANESI, Lettere di Michelangelo, Firenze, 1875, 415; GUHL, I., 228.

‡ GUHL, I., 228.

Of this he has given a description in a letter written on the 15th of October, 1520, to Michael Angelo, which from more than one point of view is exceedingly interesting. It gives us a better idea than any other document could do, of the way in which Leo used to treat his artists.

“His Holiness,” he says here, “was very much pleased that I should be ready, along with you, to undertake any kind of service which he wished ; I asked him about the subjects and the measurements and all the rest. His Holiness answered me as follows: ‘Bastiano, Juan del Aquila has told me that in the lower hall no good work can be done except on the ceiling, which you have finished, since where the cornice juts out there are certain lunettes which reach almost to the middle of the surface wall on which the pictures are intended to go. And then there are also the doors giving access to the rooms of Monsignor de’ Medici. So that it is impossible to have a picture on each wall as there ought to be. There might, however, be a picture in each lunette, since the latter are 18 or 20 palms wide, and they could have the required height given to them. For all that, in such a huge chamber these pictures would look too small.’ And further, His Holiness said to me that this hall was too open to the public. Afterwards he remarked: ‘Bastiano, on my conscience, I am not pleased with the work these men are now engaged on, and no one who has seen it has expressed approval. In four or five days I will make a personal inspection, and if I find that they have not gone on better than they have begun, I will see to it that their work is discontinued. I will find something else for them to do, remove what they have already done, and then hand over the whole place to you, as it is my intention to make a fine work of it, or I will leave it to them to paint it over with damask patterns.’ I replied that, with your assistance, I was confident we

could work wonders there. Whereupon he rejoined: 'I have no doubt about that; for all of you have learned everything from him.' And, upon my word of honour and between ourselves, His Holiness went on to say: 'Look at Raphael's paintings. As soon as he saw Michael Angelo's work he suddenly dropped the style of Perugino, and followed Michael Angelo as closely as he could; but the latter is an alarming man, as you yourself see, and there is no getting on with him.' Upon which I told His Holiness that your alarming ways did no man any harm, and that it was only your devotion to the great work to which you had given yourself that made you seem terrible to others."\*

Whether this conversation was really as flattering to Sebastiano as he makes out, must remain undecided. As a matter of fact the whole plan fell through, an issue to which a refusal to collaborate on the part of the ill-conditioned Michael Angelo contributed in no small degree. The Hall of Constantine remained in the hands of Raphael's pupils. By this arrangement the Vatican was perhaps deprived of a fine work of art, yet the Pope's loyal attachment to the pupils of the departed master leaves a very agreeable impression.

\* GAYE, II., App. 487 (with the wrong date of year 1512); GUHL, I., 226 *seq.*

## CHAPTER VIII.

LEO X. AND MICHAEL ANGELO.—PROMOTION OF THE MINOR ARTS.—THE BUILDING OF NEW ST. PETER'S.—THE PRESERVATION OF ROMAN ANTIQUITIES.

THE relations of Leo X. with Michael Angelo have long been represented as the result of the antipathy of the refined and diplomatic Pope to the rough and independent genius whom he was anxious to keep in the shade in Florence, like some uncongenial Cato.\* This view is untenable in the face of facts ; although it is true that years went by before the Pope made any call on his services. This arose from no antipathy, but from the reports made to the Pope that Michael Angelo's services were unavailable.† The latter was thus able to devote himself without disturbance to the monument to Pope Julius. Then arose the scheme of Leo X. to build a magnificent marble façade for the family church of the Medici, S. Lorenzo, in Florence. This was given to Michael Angelo to execute. The latter, and his biographer at a later date, made it appear that Leo had compelled him to abandon the Julian monument in order to give his whole attention to this new undertaking. This has been made the ground of very adverse criticism of Leo ; but the most recent research has shown that such criticism is quite groundless.‡ It was not Leo who dragged

\* Thus GRIMM, I., 5th ed., 437, and MÜNTZ, Raphaël, 434.

† JUSTI, Michelangelo, 255.

‡ Cf. JUSTI, 259 *seqq.*, whose statements I follow. He has at last



Michael Angelo away from his monument of Julius ; it was Michael Angelo who offered himself to the Pope. As a Florentine he could not resist the temptation to return to his beloved birthplace as *Sedis apostolicæ archimagister et sculptor*, and entrusted with a monumental task. The prospect of completing the adornment of a church which his honoured friend Brunelleschi had erected, and in which his once fatherly protector Lorenzo de' Medici lay at rest, was too enticing. The agreement which Michael Angelo concluded with the heirs of Julius II. on the 8th of July, 1516, shows clearly that he had already half renounced the earlier task in favour of a new one. From that day dates the abandonment of the great conception of the memorial of Julius.\*

Leo X. as well as Cardinal Medici met Michael Angelo's offers with delight, although the latter very soon assumed not only the execution of the plans, but the entire direction of the building. The whole business was to be settled by word of mouth. In the beginning of December, 1516, Michael Angelo went to Rome and showed the Pope a sketch of the façade which met with his approval. Thence he visited Carrara, in order to finish his work in connection with the monument to Julius, and arrange for the necessary quarrying of marble for the façade. The task which now confronted Michael Angelo, to carry out at the same time two enterprises of such vast scope, was one to tax the strength of Titans. Leo, who acceded to all the demands made upon him by his servant, was naturally anxious to have a plan of the façade put before him. Not until December, 1517, was one sent to Rome, and in January, 1518,

cleared up the discrepancy between the traditional account and the facts ; at the same time, as far as Michael Angelo is concerned, he has given a most satisfactory answer to the psychological problem.

\* See JUSTI, 267.

Michael Angelo himself arrived ; on the 19th of the same month an agreement was arrived at by which the latter bound himself to execute, within the term of eight years, the façade only, in accordance with the plans approved by the Pope. At the same time another agreement was made with the heirs of Julius II., who were now losing patience.\* In the deed of 1518 Michael Angelo was left free to choose the marbles from Carrara or from the newly-discovered quarries of Serravezza as he judged best. On the 20th of March he started for the last-named place, where he was destined to pass the most unproductive period of his life. Here the material for his work seems to have become an end in itself.† “ His chief care and happiness is to procure blocks of flawless whiteness for his columns.” In vain did Leo, at the end of 1518 and the beginning of 1519, give expression to his ever-increasing longing to see the beginning of at least one figure of the façade.‡ He got nothing ; Michael Angelo, who always wished to work single-handed, with this magnificent project in his head, wasted precious time on inferior work which any other man might have done quite as well. The expectation at Rome lasted all through the year 1519, but in vain. The court poets seemed to be much more occupied with the façade than the architects who had designed it.§ At last, at the beginning of the year 1520, when a quarter of the stipulated time had gone by, patience was exhausted ; the arrangement, hitherto unproductive of results, was cancelled, but not exactly in an open and conciliatory way.|| Cardinal Medici stopped the work, “ in order to relieve Michael

\* FREY, Regesten, 12-13.

† JUSTI, Michelangelo, 282.

‡ Cf. FREY, Regesten, 15.

§ Cf., e.g., The Heroica of Casanova, ed VOLPICELLA, 20.

|| JUSTI, Michelangelo, 284.

Angelo of the burden of transporting the marble." The latter considered that others had interfered to his prejudice with rights which had been guaranteed to him by contract, and begged to be released from his engagement. His letters, at this period, show clearly how deeply he was affected ; \* notwithstanding, there was no open breach with the Pope and the Cardinal. Even after the cancelling of their contract, Michael Angelo remained in favour with the Pope. On the 27th of October, Sebastiano del Piombo tried to soothe his friend's resentment. " I know how much His Holiness values you ; he speaks of you as tenderly as a brother, and shows love and appreciation, but it is you yourself who inspire the Pope with fear." † The soreness was entirely removed when, at the close of 1520, Leo X. renewed negotiations, through Cardinal Medici, with Michael Angelo with a view to a new work of importance. A second sacristy was to be added to S. Lorenzo, in the midst of which Michael Angelo was to erect unconditionally four monuments to the father, uncle, brother, and nephew of the Pope. Into this project the sculptor entered heartily. ‡

Cardinal Medici, who was above all the artistic rivalries and contentions of the time, thought nothing of employing, in various ways, Michael Angelo's antagonist, Baccio Bandinelli. The latter worked at Loreto under Andrea Sansovino. Sansovino, who, next to Michael Angelo, was the most celebrated sculptor of the Renaissance, and whose works for nobility and beauty of form approach those of Raphael, had already, in 1513, been entrusted with the plastic decoration of the outer shell of the Casa Santa at

\* *Cf. supra*, p. 345.

† FREY, Regesten, 16.

‡ FREY, Regesten, 16-18 ; *cf.* MORENI, Descrizione d. Cappella de' Principi, 17 *seq.*

Loreto as planned under Julius II. On this work Sansovino was also engaged during the Pontificate of Clement VII. Besides Bandinelli, he had as assistants Tribolo, Francesco di Sangallo, Raffaello da Montelupo, Girolamo Lombardo, Mosca, and others.\*

Rome itself was not enriched to any great extent by works of sculpture under Leo X. The most important are Michael Angelo's statue of Christ, which, in 1521, was placed in S. Maria sopra Minerva, Lorenzetto's Jonas in the mortuary chapel of the Chigi, and the bronze relief of Christ and the Woman of Samaria, to be found in the same place. The last two works, which are among the most interesting creations of the Renaissance,† were, however, only Lorenzetto's in execution; some sketch of Raphael must certainly have formed the model for the bas-relief, with its close adherence to the classic style, and perhaps for the statue of Jonas. What other master than the painter of Urbino could have conceived the living warmth of this symbol of the Resurrection, which in its modest loveliness, amenity, and strength recalls the best period of antiquity? Among the funeral monuments with which churches and chapels were now becoming filled in increasing numbers, not one reaches special pre-eminence. The colossal statue of Leo X., by Sansovino's pupil, Domenico Ami of Bologna,‡ which was erected on the Capitol by decree of the Senate, is so coarse and clumsy that it is hardly entitled to be called a work of art. Not-

\* See SCHÖNFELD, 25 *seq.*; CLAUSSE, II., 240. See also Regest. Leonis X., n. 9710 to 9711.

† Cf. BODE, Plastik, 163.

‡ Cf., for him, MARINI, Lettera, 115 *seq.*, and GREGOROVIVS, Schriften, I., 295. For the erection of the statue which has stood since 1876 in S. Maria in Aracoeli, see RODOCANACHI, Capitole, 110. Cf. LANCIANI, Scavi, I., 207 *seq.*



withstanding these defects, a contemporary German poet was found who placed the sculptor on a level with Phidias.\* Among those employed by Leo X., the Florentine Francesco de Buglioni, whose gravestone may be seen in S. Onofrio, is also to be numbered as a sculptor.†

While the art of sculpture fell into the background in a remarkable way during the age of Leo X., that of plastic decoration, along with the minor arts, developed in almost inverse ratio. It has been truly remarked that this development was due to the influence of painting,‡ but it was also fostered by the patronage of the Pope himself, whose exquisite taste gave an important direction and encouragement to these branches of art. For this reason Raphael has depicted him in his portrait as the friend of the minor arts—a portrait which differs in essential particulars from the conventional representations of Popes.

In the first place, the decoration of the Loggie again calls for attention. Here decorative art attains a classical perfection.§ Yet the delicate artistic feeling which is here paramount shows itself elsewhere in every detail. The beautiful carved doors and coffered ceilings which Leo introduced into the chambers of the Vatican can be seen by every visitor at the present day. The woodwork was executed by Giovanni Barile of Siena, and the intarsia by Fra

\* C. Silvani *Germanici in statuam Leonis X.*, P. M. silva, Romae, 1524. Also F. Novellus, in his *Vita Leonis* (Cod. Barb., lat. 2273 of the Vatican Library), describes the statue as “pulcherrima” (f. 19).

† The epitaph (FORCELLA, V., 301) calls him “familiaris domesticus Leonis X.,” and praises his wit and musical accomplishments. Cf. for him also Regest. Leonis X., n. 17462. Francesco is very likely a brother of Benedetto, of whom V. FABRICZY treats in the Riv. d' Arte, Firenze, 1904.

‡ GREGOROVIVS, VIII., 363.

§ Cf. ZIMMERMANN, II., 502.

VOL. VIII.

Giovanni da Verona.\* Of the lovely majolica pavements in the Vatican and in St. Angelo, only some fragments, however, now remain.† Specimens of the splendid majolica ware once contained in the Vatican are to be seen in the Cluny Museum in Paris, products of the manufactories of Cafagioli, Pesaro, and Gubbio, marked with the armorial bearings of Leo.‡

It is greatly to be deplored that so little remains of the goldsmiths' work of this period, owing to the costliness of the metal employed,§ for the Renaissance had now reached the highest point in the lavish use of precious stones and metals. We can obtain some notion of the treasures in workmanship of this sort which were fashioned for Leo X. from the extraordinary number of goldsmiths in his employment, a class of artificers who, next to musicians,|| hold by far the most prominent place

\* See BURCKHARDT-HOLTZINGER, *Gesch. der Renaissance*, 308 *seq.* 314; PASSAVANT, II., 265; MÜNTZ, *Raphäel*, 434 *seq.*; ROSSI, *Pasquinate*, 103. Cf. LETAROUILLY, *Vatican*, II.: *Chambres*, and GMELIN, *Ital. Skizzenbuch*, I.: *Die geschnitzten Türen im Vatikan*, Leipzig, 1879. For G. Barile, cf. *Mitteilungen des österr. Museums*, 1879.

† Cf. *supra*, p. 317. For the pavements of the Camera della Segnatura, see KLACZKO, *Jules II.*, 212. Portions of the magnificent majolica slabs of the Castle of St. Angelo were recently discovered by Borgati, and a collection of them has been placed by him in his museum.

‡ Musée Clugny, 2812: *Plat creux en forme de drageoir en faïence ital. de la fabrique de Cafagioli*, with the arms of Leo X. 2892: *Grand plat rond, fabrique de Pesaro*, with arms of Leo X. 3019: *Plat rond, fabrique de Gubbio*, with arms of Leo X. Cf. also DARCEL, *Notic. d. faïence ital.*, 98 *seq.*, and *Recueil d. faïences ital.*, Paris, 1869, p. 19, plates 26 and 49. See also BERTOLOTTI, *Artisti Urbinati in Roma, Urbino 1881*, 36 *seq.*, 64 *seq.*

§ I only know of the existence of one goblet, a gift of Leo X., at Nocera. Phot. Moscioni, Nr. 6850.

|| \*Introitus et Exitus, 551-560 (Secret Archives of the Vatican), in

in the Papal ledgers. Among the principal were the Roman, Santi di Cola Sabba, Domenico da Sutri, Michele Nardini, Caradosso, and Antonio de' Fabbri of San Marino. The last named stood next in importance to Benvenuto Cellini. Antonio, who probably took charge of the affairs of his native town at the Papal Court, was, in 1509, one of the founders of the Guild of Goldsmiths which built, under Julius II., the charming little Church of S. Eligio in the Via Giulia. He was one of the intimate friends of Chigi and Raphael.\* In those days there was no distinction drawn between the craft of the goldsmith and that of the jeweller.† The wealth of precious stones, rubies, sapphires, emeralds, diamonds, pearls, which Leo possessed in his tiaras, mitres, and pectorals, was worthy of a fairy tale. An accurate inventory of jewels taken after his death gives their value at 204,655 gold ducats.‡ The greater part of them had belonged to his predecessors; yet, despite his financial distress, Leo had added to the number by repeated purchases; § he ordered a new tiara in 1516.|| Besides various places. Items also in \*Serapica, Spese priv. di Leone X., Vol. III. (State Archives, Rome); cf. CESAREO, 210 *seq.* See also in Roman State Archives, Uffic. cam., 1515-1521: Consensi per società di uffici, f. 15<sup>b</sup>; D. Amadeo Capriolo clerico Crem. aurifici in urbe 1515, Sep. 14.

\* MÜNTZ, Raphaël, 435. Cf. *Gaz. de Beaux-Arts*, 1883, I., 502; *Arch. stor. d. Arte*, I., 37 *seq.*, 132 *seq.*

† See LUZIO, Lusso di Isabella d'Este (1896), 32.

‡ \*\*Inventario delle gioie appartenenti a Papa Leone X., of December 6, 1521; State Archives, Rome. I intend to publish, at a future date, this inventory in full, which is in many respects of great interest.

§ Cf. *Regest. Leonis X.*, n. 9787; SANUTO, XXVI., 369; CESAREO, 210 *seq.*

|| MÜNTZ, *La Tiare pontif.*, Paris, 1897, 76, denies this, incorrectly. In a \*Brief to Perugia, June 3, 1516, express mention is made of a tiara which had just been finished there. Communal Library, Perugia.

precious stones, Leo X. delighted in artistic gems, cameos, and medals.\* A master in the art of cutting gems, Pier Maria da Pescia, often called Tagliacarne after his master of that name, prepared the Pontifical Seal. Along with Tagliacarne, Vittore Gambello or Camelio, Caradosso, and Valerio Belli were distinguished as designers of medals. Among the coinage issued from the Papal mint, many pieces exist of rare beauty.†

In the domain of architecture. Julius II. bequeathed to his successor a task of the greatest importance and difficulty. At the beginning of Leo's reign, the reconstruction of St. Peter's and of the Vatican was in the same initial stage as that of the Julian Palace in the Via Giulia. To carry out and finish these vast constructions on which the bold spirit of the Rovere Pope had set to work, demanded someone other than Leo X., whose reckless extravagance and disordered finances soon deprived him of the means indispensable to the fulfilment of such projects.

\* He sometimes invited the Ambassadors to inspect his treasures, see SANUTO, XXII., 200. Cf. also FANTUZZI, III., 133. Paris de Grassis relates, Dec. 27, 1516: \*Post missam (in S. Lorenzo in Florence) papa donavit vasculum christallinum ecclesiae eidem pro usu corporis Christi in processione deferendi et ut erat extimatum est valoris trium millium duc. propter gemmas. Secret Archives of the Vatican.

† Along with the general works of FLORAVANTE, *Antiqui Rom. Pontif. denarii, Romae, 1728*; VENUTI, *Numismata Rom. Pontif., Romae, 1744*; and CINAGLI, *Le monete de' Papi, Fermo, 1848*, cf. MÜNTZ, *L'atelier monétaire de Rome, Paris, 1884*, 23, 27 *seq.*; Arts, III., 710 *seq.*; SCHULTE, I., 206 *seq.*, especially for the relations of the Fuggers with the Papal mint. See also GNECCHI, *Un zecchino di Leone X. per Ravenna, in the Riv. ital. di Numismata V.*; FRATI, *Di un ducato doro inedito di Leone X. coniato a Bologna (Nozze Publ.) Bologna, 1896*; AMBROSOLI, *Il ducato d'oro di Parma del 1513, in Arch. p. l. prov. Parmen., VIII. (1904)*. For R. Spinelli's Medal of Giuliano de' Medici, see *Jahrb. der preuss. Kunstsamml., XXV., 6*. For the medals of Leo V., see *supra*, 73 n.



Within the States of the Church the name of Leo X. is connected with few buildings. S. Cristina at Bolsena,\* the harbours and fortifications at Civita Vecchia and Ancona,† the restoration of the citadel at Civit  Castellana, and of the Vitelleschi Palace at Corneto,‡ some small hunting lodges at Magliana, Palo, Montalto, and Montefiascone, where Antonio and Francesco di Sangallo § were employed—that is all.

\* Leo X. had already, as a Cardinal, interested himself in this church. On the fa ade appear his name and the Cardinal's hat. The altar displays a relief, probably by Andrea della Robbia, which had been placed there by his orders: it represents the famous miracle in which Leo X. otherwise took so great an interest; *cf.* FUMI, *Regesti de S. Maria di Orvieto*, 108–109. For Bolsena, see GRAUS in *Kirchenschmuck*, 1901, 144, 146.

† *Cf.* SANUTO, XXI., 199, XXIII., 4, XXIV., 91; GUGLIELMOTTI, *I bastioni di Antonio da Sangallo*, Roma, 1860; *ibid.*, Pirati, I., 131 *seqq.*, and *Fortificazioni*, 245 *seqq.*; CLAUSSE, II., 105 *seqq.*, 111. At Loreto on the Torrione, near the Municipio, the following inscription, now obliterated, was once legible: “Jussu Leonis X. Florentini P. M. qui securitati prospexit templum hoc Iulianus Rudolphus a S. Maria D. Joannis Hierosolymitani Militiae Campanus Prior aggere, fossa, muro et propugnaculis muniri curavit. Anno Salutis, 1521.” Eight fine bronze lions' heads, with the diamond ring in the mouths, are still preserved in the Arsenal at Civita Vecchia; *cf.* GUGLIELMOTTI, *Fortificazioni*, 283. A similar lion's head, with the diamond ring in its mouth, is on the fa ade of the Palazzo Lante in Rome (in the courtyard is the Medicean device). Lions' heads are also to be seen on the fa ade of S. Maria in Domnica.

‡ On the fa ade is the great coat of arms of Leo X.; *cf.* *Kunstchronik*, 1901–1902, 234.

§ *Regest. Leonis X.*, n. 15202; GNOLI, *Cacce*, 42, 47 *seq.*; CLAUSSE, II., 290; Fr. Novellus, \**Vita Leonis X.* (Vatican Library) and IOANNINENSIS, *Pentatheucus*, 110<sup>b</sup>. A \*Brief, July 28, 1517, in the Communal Archives, Perugia, has reference to the support given towards the restoration of the walls of Perugia. Accounts for Leo X.'s architects in *Arch. stor. Ital.*, 3rd Series, III., 1, 217 *seq.*, and VI., 1, 183 *seq.* S. v. FABRICZY (*Die handzeichnungen Giulianos da San Gallo*, Stuttgart,

In Rome Leo X. soon abandoned the continuation of the works at the huge Julian Palace and the not less extensive plans of Bramante for the Vatican. On the other hand he began to rebuild the Church of S. Giovanni for his Florentine fellow-citizens.\* He also finished the porch of his former titular church, S. Maria in Domnica,† and the Loggie of the court of St. Damasus. The completion of the latter beautiful work was all too rapid as regards the scheme of decoration employed and the practical necessities involved. In the spring of 1520, such defects in the Loggie came to light that the Pope was obliged to exchange his apartments, which abutted upon them, for those of Cardinal Cibo.‡ The young Antonio di Sangallo was, however, soon able to obviate the danger by filling up certain spaces in the basement which had been left empty.§ Among the restorations of ancient ecclesiastical buildings in Rome, undertaken by Leo X., mention must be made of work on the church of S. Maria sopra

1902) published plans of Leo X.'s buildings. Of importance also is a \*Libro di ricordi, 1513, in the Archives of the Fabricca of St. Peter's, which gives "misure" and "stime" for different works by Bramante (Magliana, Restoration of S. Maria in Domnica, and repairs at the Vatican). Here also is an inventory of things ordered by Leonardo da Vinci on loan, for his chamber in the Belvedere.

\* Cf. SCHULTE, I., 209; CLAUSSE, San Gallo, II., 162 *seq.*; ARMELINI, Chiese, 275; LANCIANI, Scavi, I., 194.

† On the roof, thrice repeated, are the arms of Leo X. \*Paris de Grassis relates, March 19, 1519: "Quia papa antequam ad papatum assumeretur habebat titulum de Navicella et ea ecclesia erat totaliter diruta, ideo papa nunc eam restituit et pulcherrimam reddidit, propterea ivit ad stationem quae hodie ibi est." Secret Archives of the Vatican.

‡ Paris de Grassis in PASSAVANT, II., 322; Atti Mod., V., 308; and \*Letter of Ang. Germanello, April 3, 1520. Gonzaga Archives, Mantua.

§ Cf. CLAUSSE, San Gallo, II., 198.

Minerva, and the baptistery of the Lateran,\* in S. Maria Maggiore,† and in the cloisters of S. Cosimato. Considerable additions were made to the hospital of S. Spirito.‡ In the Castle of St. Angelo a small chapel was built which is still preserved.§ Of the street improvements, under the direction of Giuliano di Sangallo, we have already spoken.||

The prosecution of the rebuilding of St. Peter's was imperatively demanded by the existing condition of the old basilica.¶ Bramante's demolition had been carried out so heedlessly that the church was exposed to the winds on all sides, and, on the first recurrence of Easter Day (March 27, 1513), the celebration of divine worship was rendered impossible. Nor could the festivals of All Saints and Christmas be held in St. Peter's. Service, according to the Master of the Ceremonies, Paris de Grassis, in the remaining portion of St. Peter's would have been as

\* Cf. ROHAULT, Latran, 413, 504, pl. 34, and Fr. Novellus, \*Vita, *loc. cit.*

† See Regest. Leonis X., n. 7404.

‡ Repert. f. Kuntswiss., VII., 443.

§ The chapel is in the Cortile delle Palle ; on the façade are visible the arms of Leo X. (ring and ostrich feathers), right and left two lions' heads. Within, Leo's arms are on the roof and over one of the doors. Borgati, the restorer of St. Angelo, believes that he can prove the existence in the Uffizi of a drawing of the chapel by Michael Angelo. Leo's arms are also to be seen in St. Angelo, on two beautiful marble doors in the Cortile of Alexander VI. For the Chapel of SS. Cosmas and Damian, cf. BENIGNI, Miscell. di storia, IV., 580.

|| Cf. *supra*, p. 127 *seq.*, and LANCIANI, Scavi, I., 180, 192, 211. Giuliano di Sangallo also drew up a plan for a Medicean palace on the Piazza Navona ; see FABRICZY, Kritisches Verzeichnis der Handzeichnungen, 115, and Jahrb. d. preuss. Kunstsamml., 23, Beiheft 11-12. Cf. LANCIANI, *loc. cit.*, 209.

¶ For the unfortunately scarce views of St. Peter's during the building, see GEYMÜLLER, Entwürfe, 324 *seqq.*

unhealthy as it would have been dangerous.\* On the accession of Leo X., Bramante remained, of course, architect-in-chief for the rebuilding of St. Peter's, but he was crippled with the gout in his hands, and his seventy years were drawing to an end. His state was so precarious that already, on the 1st of November, 1513, a deputy was appointed to act with him in the person of Fra Giocondo da Verona. Yet the illustrious Veronese, who appears to have been a Franciscan and not a Dominican, was himself well stricken in years, over eighty.† Consequently, yet a third architect had to be appointed on the 14th of January, 1514, namely, Giuliano di Sangallo, who was no younger than Bramante.‡ On the 11th of March, 1514, the latter died. On his death-bed he had recommended his friend and countryman Raphael as his successor to the Pope. Leo X. was all the more willing to concur with this proposal since he knew that younger and stronger powers were needed to push forward the building of the great Church.

Raphael, at this time, was no novice in the art of architecture. In the early years of his residence at Rome, he had already given remarkable proofs of his knowledge. With the wonderful adaptability which was one of his most marked characteristics, he threw himself into the style of Bramante, and with surprising quickness saw how to assimilate the latter's ideas while preserving his own independence.

\* PARIS DE GRASSIS, *\*Diarium*. Secret Archives of the Vatican.

† Cf. MÜNTZ, *Hist. de l'Art*, II., 431 *seq.*, and the special literature there given. For Fra Giocondo's life, see CARINI in the *Atti d. Pontif., Accad. di Archeol.*, 1894. Cf. also Mél. d'archéol., 1891, 133 *seq.* How generous Leo X. was to Fra Giocondo, the latter relates in a characteristic letter, August 2, 1514, published in *Courier de l'Art*, 1888, 78.

‡ GEYMÜLLER, 257 *seq.*



Evidence of this is to be found in the now unfortunately half-ruined chapel of S. Eligio degli Orefici, which is planned in the form of a Greek cross, and was crowned by a cupola copied, apparently, from a sketch of Bramante's of a corresponding cupola in the new St. Peter's. There is strong evidence that, about this same time, he was engaged on the Farnesina for Agostino Chigi.\*

Raphael, who, since the 1st of April, 1514, had provisionally taken Bramante's place as architect of St. Peter's† at a yearly salary of 300 gold ducats, appreciated to the full the honour and good fortune conferred on him by this new undertaking. Henceforward, so he expressed himself, he could live nowhere else but in Rome, and this "from love for the building of St. Peter's." "What place on earth," he wrote on the 1st of July, 1514, to Simone Ciarla, "can compare with Rome in dignity? What task can be nobler than the construction of St. Peter's? This is certainly the first church in the world, and the greatest building that man has ever yet seen; the cost will

\* Cf. GEYMÜLLER, Raffaello Sanzio studiato come architetto, 24 *seq.* According to Geymüller, Raphael not only planned the actual Villa Farnesina, but also the stable buildings and the Loggia in the adjoining garden.

† See the accounts in FEA, 9, from Cod. H., II., 22, in the Chigi Library, Rome. Fuller accounts are to be found in another \*Codex, Cod. chart. s. XVI., 4°, 18 × 23½ cm., 159 folio pages of identical date (the first four and last four corresponding pages are missing), in the Archives of the Fabbrica of St. Peter's, which is labelled "spese 1514." Of this account-book Dr. Kallab, some of whose notes SCHULTE (I., 175) has already made use of, has thoroughly treated. Here are found not only receipts of Raphael, but also of Giuliano di Sangallo, the other Sangallo's, and Fra Giocondo's, among others, stonemasons', carpenters', etc., engaged on the construction of St. Peter's. Some of these notices in MÜNTZ, *Hist. de Raphaël*, 133. SPRINGER, 295, is incorrect in putting Raphael's salary at 700 ducats; REUMONT, III., 2, 405, makes a mistake in dating his appointment from 1516.

amount to a million in gold. The Pope has ordered a payment of 60,000 ducats for the works. He thinks of nothing else; he has associated me," he goes on to say without reserve, "with an experienced monk who has passed his eightieth year. The Pope sees that he cannot live much longer, and His Holiness has therefore determined that I should benefit by the instructions of this distinguished craftsman and attain to greater proficiency in the art of architecture, of the beauties of which he has recondite knowledge; his name is Fra Giocondo. The Pope gives us audience every day, and keeps us long in conversation on the subject of the building."\*

On the 1st of August, 1514, Leo X. issued his final instructions as to the position and relative functions of the three architects of St. Peter's. Fra Giocondo and Raphael were appointed architects-in-chief. The salary of the former, as the senior, was fixed at 400 gold ducats;†

\* PUNGILEONI, 157 *seq.*; GUHL, I., 93 *seq.*

† None of the scholars who have dealt with the new building of St. Peter's, not even Müntz and Geymüller, have been aware of this. On account of the great importance of the circumstance, I give the \*Brief as taken from the Codex in series No. 3 of the Ambrosian Library, fol. 115:—\*Iocundo architecto. Cum te iis in muneribus omnibus obeundis, quae ad bonum architectum pertinent, egregium ac praestantem esse eamque artem recte callere et semper antea intellexerimus et nuper post Bramantis obitum in principis apostolorum templi Romani a fe. re. Julio II.º instituti, ea parte quam quidem ipsi inchoatam potuis quam confectam videmus totiusque templi exemplo recognoscendo tuum ipse ingenium et virtutem exaedificandique peritiam abunde probaveris: nos quibus nihil est fere antiquius, quam ut id templum quam magnificentissime quamque celerrime construatur, te magistrum eius operis constituimus cum salario ducatorum quadringentorum auri camerae nostrae tibi annis singulis persolvendorum a nostris pecuniarum, quae ad ipsius templi aedificationem erogantur ad nosque perferuntur, magistris, a quibus id salarium aequis pro tempore portionibus dari tibi cum petieris sine ulla mora etiam

that of Raphael at 300.\* Giuliano di Sangallo at the same time received 300 ducats a years; he did not, however, rank with the "master" architects, but was styled "administrator and coadjutor,"† which means that he was

*mensibus singulis mandamus. Hortamur autem in domino devotionem tuam, ut huius muneris curam ita suscipias, ut in eo exercendo cum existimationis tuae ac nominis, tum amoris erga te nostri paternaeque caritatis, demum et templi, quod in toto orbe terrarum longe omnium maximum atque sanctissimum semper fuit, maiestatis et celebritatis et in ipsum principem apostolorum debitae a nobis pietatis et reverentiae rationem habuisse videare. Dat. Romae die p<sup>a</sup> Aug<sup>ti</sup> 1514, anno secundo.*

\* The Brief to Raphael is in BEMBI, Epist., IX., 13 (*cf.* App. No. 22). In the Register Book of the Ambrosian Library the original form is given. The following variants are there found:—*aedificiis* for *aedibus*; *exemplo* for *forma*; *fere antiquius* for *prope a*; *templum* for *phanum*; *constituimus* for *facimus*; *salario ducator. tercentorum auri camerae nostrae* for *stipendio numum aureor. trecentor.*; *persolvendorum* for *curandorum*; *ipsius templi* for *eius phani*; *salarium* for *stipendium*; *mandamus* for *iubeo*; *Hortamur autem te in Domino ut* for *Te vero horror ut*; *quibus* for *quoniam*; *in iuvenili tua aetate* for *iuvenili aetate*; *paternaeque caritatis* for *paternaeque in te benevolentiae*; *templi* for *phani*. After *pietatis* in Cod. Ambros. follows *et reverentiae*. Die prima Aug. is altered in print into Cal. Aug.

† In Cod. Ambros., f. 115, this likewise hitherto unknown \*Brief runs as follows:—\**Iuliano de Sancto Gallo. De peritia in architecturae arte diligentiaque tua mortis iam annos nobis probata et perspecta plenam fiduciam habentes, cum nihil sit fere nobis antiquius, quam ut principis apostolorum templum romanum a fe. re. Julio II. predecessore nostro inchoatum quam magnificentissime quamque celerrime construatur, te in eius operis administrum et coadiutorem constituimus cum salario ducatorum tercentorum auri de camera tibi annis singulis persolvendorum a nostris pecuniarum, quae ad ejus templi aedificationem erogantur ad nosque perferuntur, magistris. Quamobrem te hortamur, ut omnem curam adhibeas, quo omnes intelligant nos de tua peritia recte sentire et tu eius templi, quod in toto orbe terrarum longe omnium maximum atque sanctissimum semper fuit, maiestatis et celebritatis et in ipsum principem apostolorum debitae a nobis*

principally responsible for the carrying out of the works. In Raphael's Brief it is expressly stated that he had qualified for the position by the new design for St. Peter's which he had executed at the wish of the Pope. On the death of Fra Giocondo\* on the 1st of July, 1515, Raphael became sole architect-in-chief of St. Peter's. The earnestness with which he threw himself into the work is clearly shown in the letters addressed to Baldassare Castiglione soon after his appointment. "Our Sovereign," we read, "while conferring on me an honour, has laid a heavy load upon my shoulders—the burden of anxiety for the building of St. Peter's. I hope not to lay it down, and all the more so as the model of the edifice which I have made pleases His Holiness, and has been praised by many men of good understanding. But my desires reach further; would that I could attain to the beauty of form of the buildings of antiquity; yet I know not whether this may not be but the flight of Icarus. Vitruvius certainly gives me much light, still he does not give enough."†

We see that the first design, from which Giovanni Barile executed a model in wood, failed to please its author. He therefore set to work on a second design which, like the first, has been lost. Indeed, of Raphael's work as a whole as architect of St. Peter's, not a line has been preserved from his own hand.‡ Other sources of information are but scanty; important evidence is afforded by a coin

pietatis et reverentiae rationem habuisse videare. Dat. Romae p<sup>o</sup> Augusti, 1514, anno secundo.

\* SANUTO, XX., 363; GEYMÜLLER, 277.

† BOTTARI, Raccolta, I., 116; GUHL, I., 95.

‡ GEYMÜLLER, Ursprüngl. Entwürfe, 277. The following description is based on the remarkable investigations of this illustrious authority on architecture, to whom also MÜNTZ, 566 *seqq.*, is indebted for his information.



which represents St. Peter's, on one side, in the form of a Greek cross, as shown on the medal of Julius II., and on the other in that of a Latin cross which Leo X. is offering to St. Peter.\* We may conclude from this that the Medici Pope had decided, probably on weighty liturgical grounds, to substitute a building, in the longitudinal basilica form, in place of the plan originally contemplated by Bramante. Thus Raphael could acquiesce in this change without disrespect to the memory of the friend to whose recommendation he owed his present position. On the other hand Bramante seems, during his last years, to have become, to all appearance, reconciled† to the new design. From this point of view Panvinio was right in saying later that Raphael had followed in Bramante's footsteps, and Sebastiano Serlio in praising him as the perfecter of Bramante's plans. The ground-plan published as Raphael's by Serlio in his work, which appeared in 1540,‡ has been pronounced, as the result of modern investigation, to be so inadequate and inaccurate that, taken by itself, it is well-nigh useless.§ It is only by examination of the ground-plan of Giuliano di Sangallo and the memorial of his nephew Antonio that it is possible to come to any exact conclusion as to the real intentions of Raphael. The memorial,|| which sets forth a draft of a critical report on the building of St. Peter's intended for

\* Specimens of this rare piece in Berlin and Paris. Engraving in GEYMÜLLER, plate 2, fig. 4; *cf.* pp. 259 *seq.*, 319. TIZIO mentions this coin, \*Hist. Senen. Cod. G, II., 39 (Chigi Library, Rome). He explains it, very strangely, with reference to Leo's approaching death.

† *Cf.* Vol. VI. of this work, 467, n.

‡ SERLIO, *Dell architettura*, I, 3.

§ GEYMÜLLER, *Zeitschrift für bildende Kunst*, X., 252 *seq.*, and *Ursprüngl. Entwürfe*, 279 *seq.*

|| Printed in VASARI (ed. Le Monnier), X., 25 *seq.* Date assigned and criticism given by GEYMÜLLER, *Ursprüngl. Entwürfe*, 293-303.

the Pope, is dated the 1st of July, 1515, the day on which Fra Giocondo died and on which Giuliano di Sangallo withdrew from the work on account of ill-health. (He died October 20, 1516.)\* From this it appears that Raphael, departing from Bramante's arrangement, had planned a longitudinal building of great length with transepts and a cupola too heavy for its supporting pillars. To rectify these faults in Raphael's original design, which were so sharply criticized in the memorial, Antonio di Sangallo, who had been appointed coadjutor on the 22nd of November, 1516, prepared a number of studies.† These materials throw light on Raphael's intentions. It may be considered certain that, in succession to the plan censured by Antonio di Sangallo, Raphael constructed a second which was apparently satisfactory. From this second plan Serlio made his copy, which, on the whole, is inaccurate, but still, in the combination of nave and dome, as well as in the rich pillared vestibule, discloses a truly Raphaellesque harmony of proportions.‡

The project in its entirety was never, as is well known, brought to completion. There is evidence to show that, under Raphael's direction, only the small pillars, which stand on both sides of the pillars of the dome, were built to a height of about twelve metres, and that the arcades of the south aisle were ceiled. Whether Vasari's statement, that Raphael, along with Fra Giocondo and Giuliano

\* Cf. FABRICZY in Jahrb. d. preuss. Kunstsamml., XXIII., Beiheft 12. He also gives, according to \*Div. cam., 1519-1523, f. 99, the dispensation of Leo X. regarding the site of a house given to Giuliano, which the latter sold in 1515 to Giacomo da Brescia, who built thereon a palace, now the Palazzo Costa.

† CLAUSSE, II., 121. Cf. MÜNTZ, Gaz. d. Beaux-Arts, XX. (1879), 523.

‡ GEYMÜLLER, Ursprüngl. Entwürfe, 316-322; cf. plate 35, fig. 1.

di Sangallo, also strengthened the foundations of new St. Peter's, is correct or not, must remain an open question.\* On the other hand, the evidence of Paris de Grassis makes it certain that Raphael began his work at once, and that in April, 1514, he had completed what was required to ensure the temporary security of the remaining portion of old St. Peter's, and to render it serviceable for divine worship.† The process of demolition continued during the reign of Leo X.: in November, 1519, the whole portico of the basilica lay in ruins.‡ Raphael's successor as architect of St. Peter's was Antonio di Sangallo. Baldassare Peruzzi was appointed his coadjutor.§

The inconsiderable results attained by Raphael during his six years as architect of St. Peter's are accounted for by the difficulties which presented themselves in procuring funds for the vast construction. The Pope had originally assigned a yearly donation of 60,000 ducats; this sum was realized principally by means of the issue of indulgences. To what momentous results this led in Germany has already been described; and also among the Latin peoples a

\* GEYMÜLLER, *loc. cit.*, 323. For the actual execution Raphael employed the skilled master of work Giuliano Leno; see JOVANOVIĆ, 68, and MÜNTZ, L. da Vinci, 457 *seq.* A satire on G. Leno is mentioned by SANUTO, XXXII., 290.

† I take the following from a hitherto unnoticed passage in Paris de Grassis, *Diarium*, April 16, 1514: \**Etiam appositum est pallium ad altare id est ad faciem posteriorem, quae respicit corpus basilicae. Ipsa basilica heri finita est in cupula sive in novo emicaelo fabricari sic ut papa potuit cum prius non potuerit celebrare.* Secret Archives of the Vatican. By the *emicaelum* I am disposed to understand the large provisional choir of Bramante, built on the foundations of that of Nicholas V., and which stood till 1585. Cf. GEYMÜLLER, *Entwürfe*, 134-135.

‡ Paris de Grassis in DELICATI-ARMELLINI, 76.

§ *Gaz. des Beaux-Arts*, XX. (1879), 523. GEYMÜLLER, *Entwürfe*, 100, 358.

strong opposition had arisen. The Ambassador of the King of Portugal had certainly undertaken, on the 21st of May, 1514, to remit to the Pope 50,000 ducats from the proceeds of the Jubilee which had been authorized in his Sovereign's dominions,\* but in Spain no less a man than Ximenes had often protested against the Indulgence for the building fund of St. Peter's.† The Republic of Venice, in March, 1515, forbade the publication of this indulgence within its territories: at a later date this injunction was insisted on more strongly.‡ The more meagre the returns of the indulgence money the more strenuous were Leo's exertions to raise funds in other ways. He made use of the *Fabbrica di S. Pietro* as already constituted by

\* Arm., XXXIV., t. 18 (Instr. cam.), f. 15<sup>b</sup>, of the Secret Archives of the Vatican: \**Obligatio Regis Portugallie. Cum sit quod Sanctissimus Dominus Noster D. Leo papa X. ad requisitionem Illmi D. D. Hemanuelis regis Portugallie tam pro fabrica principis Apostolorum de urbe quam pro sustinendo bello et expeditione per ipsum regem contra Mauros et infideles suscepta concesserit in regno Portugallie Iubileum duraturum quo per dictum regem contra Mauros et infideles bellum geretur et idem rex contra dictos infideles exercitum paratum et expeditum in castris habebit et alias prout in bulla desuper expedita plenius continetur. Hinc est quod anno domini 1514, die 21 Maii constituti coram me notario etc., magnifici domini D. Tristanus de Acugura (=Acunha?) miles Didacus Pacechus et Johannes de Faria doctores omnes oratores prenominati regis sponte etc., non vi etc., nomine dicti regis promiserunt et se in forma camere etc., obligaverunt solvere dicto S. D. N. pro dicta fabrica duc. auri de camera quinquaginta milia ex primis fructibus et introitibus colligendis et percipiendis ex dicto jubileo juran. etc., renuntian. etc., rogan. etc. Acta fuerunt Rome in palatio apostolico et camera Rmi D. Cardinalis sanctorum quatuor coronatorum presentibus ibidem dominis Iacobo Sadoletto S. d. n. pape secretario et Dominico Crispo secretario prefati Rmi D. Cardinalis Sanctorum quatuor, etc. Et me Io. de Att. rog.*

† See WETZER and WELTE'S *Kirchenlexikon*, XII., 2nd ed., 1835.

‡ SANUTO, XX., 52, XXV., 390; CICOGLA, 395.



Julius II. On its officials he conferred the extraordinary privilege of watching over the scrupulous execution of testamentary dispositions to the profit of the building expenses.\* Besides this, Leo enjoined in very many instances that one-half of the receipts from indulgences of other kinds should be apportioned to this purpose.† But even this helped little; in almost all directions a strong reaction against the Indulgence was manifested.‡

On the top of all this came Leo X.'s extravagance and financial disorder. It was no wonder that, like so many other undertakings, the building of St. Peter's also came more and more to a standstill. As early as 1517 § it was a jest among the Romans that Leo would never finish the work of Julius.|| It was a current tale in Italy that the Pope handed over the receipts from the sale of the St. Peter's Indulgence to his sister Maddalena.¶ In Germany the calumny was widespread that the stones intended for the Church of St. Peter found their way by night to the palaces of the Pope's nephews.\*\* Despite Leo's solemn

\* For this see the rare document, *Compendio di teorica e di pratica d. rev. Fabbrica di S. Pietro*, Roma, 1793. Here belong the \*\*Briefs to Bologna, dated Rome, 1520, December 4 (State Archives, Bologna), and to Alfonso of Ferrara, of 27th December, 1520 (State Archives, Modena).

† Cf. SANUTO, XX., 61, XXVII., 147, 379; Regest. Leonis X., n. 12,275; SCHULTE, I., 75; LUZIO, Isabella d'Este, 74.

‡ SCHULTE, I., 167, 171, 173.

§ About St. Peter's in the year 1518, cf. LANCELOTTI, III., 179.

|| Giorn. d. lett. Ital., XLII., 90. Cf. also the satires quoted in Vol. VI. of this work, 469 seq.

¶ This narrative, produced by Guicciardini and spread further by Sarpi, is a lie. F. Contelorius had already remarked that not a trace of evidence was to be found in the Secret Archives of the Vatican. SCHULTE, I., 173 seq., agrees with him.

\*\* STRAUSS, Hutten, I., 308, 311.

assurance of his zeal for the building of the new basilica, "which takes precedence of all churches upon earth and is a guarantee for the security of the Christian religion,"\* he was the object of a far-reaching distrust. In May, 1519, a Venetian openly declared that the delays in the building of St. Peter's arose from the want of the main thing—money.† In November, 1521, four courts of the monastery of St. Peter were sold to defray building expenses.‡

How heavily the tardy progress of the work weighed upon Raphael is to be seen from a letter of the Ferrarese Envoy of the 17th of December, 1519. "The master," it says, "has often been very strange since he took Bramante's place."§ He was also constantly employed on other architectural commissions: thus he drew designs for several private palaces in the Borgo, among which that of the Papal Chamberlain, Branconio dell' Aquila, was foremost. Unfortunately this building|| was sacrificed to make way for the colonnades of the Piazza of St. Peter's. On the other hand, the Pandolfini Palace at Florence, built after designs by Raphael, has been preserved.¶

An evil fortune has presided over the so-called Villa Madama, built for Cardinal Giulio de' Medici. Placed in a charming site on the eastern slope of Monte Mario, this villa, although never completed and fallen into sad decay with the lapse of time, has always attracted the attention of artists; it has quite recently been made the subject of a

\* Regest. Leonis X., n. 13,053.

† SANUTO, XXVII., 274; CICOGLIA, 400.

‡ SANUTO, XXXII., 149. Fines were also appropriated by Leo X. for the building fund; see Paris de Grassis, ed. DELICATI-ARMELLINI, 69.

§ Atti Mod., I., 136.

|| The Palazzo Spada is probably a free reproduction.

¶ Cf. *supra*, p. 115 n.

thorough investigation and most pleasing description.\* An answer, however, has not yet been found to several questions connected with this interesting structure. Whether the plans were already drawn 1516-1517† cannot be decided. It is certain, on the evidence of Baldassare Castiglione, that the building was well advanced in June, 1519, and often visited by the Pope,‡ but that in August, 1522, the work was not yet finished.§ Castiglione also vouches that Raphael drew the original plan. Its grandeur and beauty are attested to this day by two drawings exhibited in his studio. The execution of the building, however, was carried out in accordance with a third plan which has, unfortunately, been lost.|| The whole is in wonderful harmony with the natural character of the gentle ascent on which it stands; every advantage has been taken, by the inspiration of genius, of the beauties of the situation. The domestic offices, the dwelling and reception rooms, the loggie and terraces, the theatre and racecourse, the grottoes, fountains, and gardens, are connected by flights

\* TH. HOFMANN, *Raffael als Architekt*, I., Villa Madama zu Rom., Dresden, 1900. Besides these editions de luxe, *cf.* also NIBBY, *Roma mod.*, II., 944 *seq.*; D'ARCO, *Giulio Romano*, Mantova, 1842, 11 *seq.*; GAYE in *Kunstblatt*, 1835, No. 4; REUMONT in *Zahns Jahrb. f. Kunstwissenschaft*, II.; REDTENBACHER in *d. Zeitschr. für bild. Kunst*, 1876, 33 *seq.*; MINGHETTI, *Raffaello*, 166, n. 251-252; GRIMM, *Raphaël*, 489 *seq.*; GEYMÜLLER, *Raffaello come architetto*, 59 *seq.*, 87 *seq.*, 91 *seq.*; CLAUSSE, II., 203 *seq.*, III., 310 *seq.*; *Jahrb. d. preuss. Kunstsamml.*, XXV., 32 *seq.*, and *Gaz. des Beaux-Arts*, 1903, I., 314 *seq.*

† GEYMÜLLER, *Raffaello come architetto*, 69, and *Doc. inéd. sur les Mss. des San Gallo*, Paris, 1885, 19.

‡ \*B. Castiglione to Isabella d'Este, June 16, 1519; Gonzaga Archives, Mantua. This letter shows that MÜNTZ (*Hist.*, II., 251) is mistaken when he places the beginning of the Villa Madama in 1520.

§ Letter of B. Castiglione, August 13, 1522, in PUNGILEONI, *Elogio*, 181-182.

|| *Cf.* SEMPER in the *Allg. Ztg.*, 1901, Beil. 136.

of steps and adjusted to the conformation of the ground. Taken all in all, it is the earliest example of the combination of garden, landscape, and architecture in the laying out of the grounds of an Italian villa. The terrace commands a noble panorama of the city, the Campagna, the long chain of the Apennines, and sharp-pointed Soracte. When completed, this "Vigna de' Medici" must certainly have been the most beautiful villa of the Renaissance.

The decorations of the stately halls were the work of Giovanni da Udine and Giulio Romano. The central point of splendour was the triple-arched Loggia, sixteen metres high, in the middle of which were displayed the Medici arms. Further decorations consisted of reliefs in stucco and fresco; here were seen the Seasons, Jupiter, Juno, Neptune, Pluto, and Proserpine; in the frieze which ran underneath the dome-shaped ceiling, antique divinities, satyrs, and nymphs were repeated. In the eastern dome of the exedra the love of Polyphemus for Galatea is depicted. In like manner only antique subjects are represented throughout, along with the heraldic bearings and the device\* of the owners of the villa.†

When we take into consideration that Cardinal Giulio de' Medici was a prelate of thorough earnestness and morality, the decoration of his villa gives us a full measure of the extent to which Roman society in all its circles was penetrated by the spirit of classical antiquity. Another proof is afforded by the general awakening of reverence for the venerable relics of early Roman history,‡ in which the

\* A sunbeam falling through a burning glass, kindles a tree, hence the inscription: Candor illesus. A part of the ceiling was at last finished in 1525; see HOFFMANN, 21; CLAUSSE, II., 216.

† Cf. HOFFMANN, 17, 22.

‡ On the other hand, remains of other ages did not yet meet with any intelligent understanding; this was shown in a striking way, in



Eternal City was then incomparably richer than it is to-day. The weightiest evidence of this is the celebrated Brief of Leo X. to Raphael, of the 27th of August, 1515,\* in which the Pope commits "the destiny of the antiquities of Rome" to the hands of this enthusiast for ancient art. At the same time he appoints the architect of St. Peter's to be chief overseer of all the remains in marble and stone which should be exhumed within Rome or within a radius of ten miles from it. Under the penalty of a heavy fine, each one was bound to report to him, within three days, any discovery of this kind, in order that he might decide what part of this material seemed of use for the building of St. Peter's. But such remains were not to be utilized for this purpose without discrimination, as had hitherto been the custom; Leo X. expressly commands the preservation of all those portions on which are carved inscriptions or other representations. "Such things often contain some important memorial, and are well worth safeguarding for the advantage of science and the classic purity of the Latin language." In these closing sentences of his letter lies its essential significance; Leo X. has hereby established a claim on the gratitude of all men of learning.

An appointment of Raphael as overseer and custodian of the collective antiquities of Rome, within the jurisdiction of the city, cannot be deduced from the Papal Brief without doing violence to the text.† How much importance

1519, when the sarcophagi in the mausoleum of Honorius were destroyed. That many ancient relics were destroyed even under Leo X. is certain; see MÜNTZ, *Antiquités*, 44 *seq.*

\* In an altered form in BEMBI, *Epist.*, X., 51. The original phraseology I give from a MS. of the Ambrosian Library, App. No. 22.

† *Cf.* MÜNTZ, *Raphaël*, 601. It is surprising to still find the old erroneous view in ZIMMERMANN, II., 484. KOOPMANN is likewise mistaken, 312 ("the leader-in-chief of excavations"); REDTENBACHER,

Leo X. attached to the preservation of ancient remains is shown by his erecting, in the vestibule of the Pantheon, the wonderful porphyry cistern from the Baths of Agrippa, destined at a later date to receive the bones of Clement XII. On two large marble slabs, still to be seen in the Pantheon, he caused an inscription to be placed which relates that this was done in order that a work of such conspicuous elegance might be handed down to posterity unimpaired.\* An antique votive boat, found on the island in the Tiber, he had carried to the open space before his former titular church, S. Maria in Domnica, which thenceforward was called "della Navicella." The humanists celebrated this discovery in verse, and interpreted it as a happy augury for the reign of Leo. In general the Leonine period was remarkably poor in the recovery of antiquities as compared with the previous epoch of Julius II.†

The most remarkable archæological discovery which was made under Leo X. was the result of excavations on the site of a temple of Isis near the Church of S. Stefano del Cacco; earlier attempts had shown that a statue of great size lay there. Renewed exploration was followed by brilliant results, for there came to light two colossal statues of the best Roman period, the Nile and the Tiber; Leo X. became the owner of these statues of the two river gods and placed them in the midst of the Belvedere gardens. A further service was rendered by the 203 ("director of excavations and antiquities.") Cf., at present day, also LANCIANI, *Scavi*, 166 *seq.*

\* This characteristic inscription, which has not, to my knowledge, been published, runs: Leo X. Pont. Max. providentissimus || princeps vas elegantissimum || en lapide Numidico ne pollutum || negligentie sordibus obsolesceret || in hunc modum reponi exornarique || jussit. || Bartholomeus Valla || Ramundus Capoferreus || aediles fac. cur. ||

† Cf. SANUTO, XXVII., 470; CICOGLA, 405; GAYE, II., 139; Arch. stor. Ital., 5th Series, XVII., 429; Rev. archéol., 1884, IV., 49.

Pope to the collection of antiquities begun by his predecessors when he had the tact to decline the request of Francis I. that he should hand over to the latter the group of the Laocöon. Nor should the fact be omitted that Leo X., while denying access strictly to his private collection of antiques in Raphael's Loggie, threw open without restriction the statuary courts of the Belvedere. Rome was thus put in possession of a second public museum in addition to that on the Capitol. The gratitude of after ages has exaggerated the services of Leo X., since it has ascribed to him also the acquisition of works such as the Cleopatra and the Laocöon, which undoubtedly date back to the days of Julius II.\*

The noteworthy fact that Leo X., in the tradition of later generations, has overshadowed his predecessor, who was undoubtedly a much more remarkable man, is in nowise limited by the interest which the former evinced in the domain of ancient plastic art. This circumstance repeats itself with more or less insistence throughout the whole range of artistic activity. The lavish generosity with which Leo supported the humanist poets and men of learning has been put down to his credit with so high a rate of interest, that for centuries the Leonine epoch has been counted as the meridian of splendour not only of the Roman but of the whole Italian Renaissance in general.

\* The above, from the exhaustive researches of MICHAELIS, *Geschichte d. Statuenhofes im vaticanischen Belvedere*, in *Jahrb. d. deutsch. archäol. Instituts*, V., 1890, 24 to 26. See also LANCIANI, *Scavi*, 155. The following entry in \**Divers. Cam.*, LXXI., f. 165<sup>b</sup>, refers to the statue of Cleopatra : *Creditum D Ier<sup>mi</sup> de Maffeis pro statua Cleopatre posita super fonte Belvedere nuncup. sub die 18 Dec. 1521.* (Secret Archives of the Vatican.) For Leo's removal of ancient statues from Tivoli, see MARINI, *Lettera*, 117. For the private collections of antiquities in Rome, see MÜNTZ, *Raphaël*, 591 *seq.*, and *Le Musée du Capitole*, Paris, 1882, 12 *seq.*, and especially LANCIANI, *Scavi*, 159 *seq.*

To this has contributed in no small measure the glamour which clings to the name of Medici. All that his forefathers, especially his father, Lorenzo the Magnificent, did for art, has been reflected back upon the Pope, as well as the artistic culture of his relatives, Giulio, Giuliano, and Lorenzo, and of his surroundings.\* Finally, the after reputation of Leo X. was greatly affected by the circumstance that in him culminated that all-embracing patronage of art which had begun with Nicholas V. His successor, Adrian VI., stood quite aloof from the Renaissance; besides, he was occupied with tasks of a different and more urgent kind. Clement VII. was certainly not unwilling to follow on in the path trodden by Leo X., but the innumerable mischances of his reign left him only scanty possibilities of doing anything in this direction. Thus after Leo X. came times of gloom, especially for art; men looked back with yearning at the Leonine era, which still shone in contrast with a more brilliant light.

The picture of Leo X. as the patron of art, which has been sketched by the humanists as the dispensers of posthumous fame, and which, in its exaggeration, has obscured the deserts of his predecessor, who in this very particular had a special glory of his own, has for centuries struck the key-note of current opinion. The most recent research has at length administered impartial justice. The earlier tradition, which hailed Leo X. as the "appreciative patron of all artists," and celebrated him as the glorious continuator of the work of Julius II., must now be discounted. On more sober reflection we are astonished that such a conception could have been generally formed; for it was exactly in this particular that Leo X. fell short,

\* The chief patrons of art among the Cardinals were Bibbiena, Cibo, and Pucci, among the prelates Pandolfini, Branconio dell' Aquila, B. Turini da Pescia. *Cf. supra*, pp. 112 *seq.*, 115 *seq.*



namely, that instead of carrying forward the work of his predecessor, he threw himself into countless new enterprises which diverted his attention from points of capital importance.

As regards taste and understanding in the matter of the imaginative arts, Julius II., who was an enthusiast in his feeling for all *chefs-d'œuvre*, was incomparably greater than his successor, whose chief predilection lay in decorative art. There can be no doubt that the former "formed a more reverent conception of art, recognized more fully the grandeur of its aims, and paid it freer homage as one of the ideal institutions of life" than the refined and subtle Medici, who thrust his own personality much more "into the foreground, and valued art chiefly as a means of heightening the pleasure of life." \* It is in accordance with this judgment that even the creations which Julius II. called into being excel in subject and beauty the works of the Leonine age, some of which are one-sided in conception and have been praised to excess; of these only the cartoons stand on the same level as the two first Stanze. Strongly as this must be emphasized, yet the just attribution of what is due to the credit of Julius II. ought not to lead to a petty disparagement of the merits of Leo X.; this has been carried to such a pitch in certain quarters that there is a danger of falling into the opposite extreme.† Here, as in

\* SPRINGER, 229.

† The exaggerated estimate of Leo's influence on art as well as literature is the outcome of the panegyrics of the humanists; yet this view has held its ground for long. The Medici were favourites of fortune in their lifetime and in their posthumous fame. Biographers like Giovio, and his successor Roscoe, three centuries later, have drawn a picture in which the light predominates. Individual criticisms of the artistic patronage of Leo and his relation to Julius II. (1822, FEA, *Notizie*, 44 *seq.*; and 1831, RUMOHR, *Forschungen*, III., 122 *seq.*) produced no effect, Roscoe remained the classical authority. Even

other matters, the truth will be found to lie midway between the two.

As regards the general development of the art of the Renaissance, it is undoubtedly true that in the time of Leo X. it had reached its turning-point, and that many signs of decadence had made themselves visible. But the Pope cannot be held responsible for this natural evolution of things, which constitutes, on the contrary, his acquittal, since it explains why the principal works produced in his reign cannot bear comparison with those of the epoch of Julius II. The previous remark, that Leo X. was inferior to his predecessor in artistic taste and judgment, must not be taken as implying that he was lacking in understanding in these matters. Such an opinion is contradicted by the

Gregorovius keeps him company. In 1882 SEMPER (Carpi, 10) still wrote of "the most glorious phase of the Renaissance under Leo X." Neither Ranke nor Creighton bestows on art, in the least degree, the attention due to it. Reumont showed a great advance, and Springer, in his work on Raphael and Michael Angelo, a step greater. Independent of both are RIO (*Art Chrétien*, IV., 1867) and Reichensberger, who, as strong admirers of the Gothic, are quite out of sympathy with Leo. After MÜNTZ (1891, *Hist. de l'Art*, II., 246; *cf.* 302, 337) had advanced a still more favourable conception of Leo's relations to art, GNOLI followed on the same ground with a judgment of great severity (*Secolo di Leon X., Le Arti in the Riv. d'Italia* 1897, 74-93). Highly as I recognize the great services of this censor, I am bound to say that he has fallen into the extreme of condemnation. In many cases he has altogether overshot the mark. MASI (202 *seq.*, 210) rightly finds extenuating circumstances, and insists on Leo's services to Raphael. It is impossible, however, for anyone at the present day to say any longer, like HÖFLER (*Histor. Jahrb.*, 1888, 61), that in Leo "we see the culmination of his age, when the seed sown by the preceding generation produced its harvest in literature and art in the works of Raphael and Bramante." I have tried in the following observations to keep a middle line between exaggerated praise and undue depreciation. *Cf.* CIAN in *Giorn. d. lett. Ital.*, XLVIII., 425.

fact that, in choosing the plans for S. Giovanni dei Fiorentini, he rejected, along with those of Peruzzi and Antonio di Sangallo, the designs of his beloved Raphael himself, and gave his decision in favour of the scheme of Jacopo Sansovino.\* If, notwithstanding, great architectural creations did not arise at his bidding, the chief reason is to be found in the confusion of his finances and the multiplicity of his interests.

Sculpture as well as architecture lost its due pre-eminence. It must be remembered that Leo at once took upon himself the expenses of the decoration of the Holy House at Loreto, and in this instance also he was only carrying out the undertaking of his predecessor. The most recent investigations have exonerated Leo, beyond contradiction, in his dealings with Michael Angelo. He always "gave the latter a free hand in the most generous way;" if the great projects which he had prepared for Michael Angelo came to nothing, the blame does not lie with the Pope.† His preference for decorative art was certainly characteristic of the æsthetic tendencies of his house and of its love of splendour; but it was also a part of the Papal tradition, handed down to him, and in and for itself is by no means to be despised.

Leo X. has been heavily censured for his disregard of other eminent painters and his exclusive partiality for Raphael; but even the most severe critics cannot deny, herein, his services to art.‡ It is true that recently attempts have been made to belittle and set aside this, the most attractive aspect of his patronage of the fine arts. Since Leo's chief glory as the patron of art is due to the protection given to Raphael, there seems justification for

\* MÜNTZ, *Hist. d. l'Art*, II., 247; *cf.* Raphaël, 476.

† *Cf.* JUSTI, 257 *seq.*; see *supra*, p. 348 *seq.*

‡ GNOLI as quoted, *supra*, p. 378 n.

taking a glance backward in order to examine this question more closely.

In the first place, it admits of no dispute that the Pope drew too often and in too many different directions upon the inexhaustible resources of the painter's genius.\* If, however, it is further asserted that the majority of these tasks were beneath the high level of his powers,† the criticism is not less wide of the mark than that which judges Leo's preference for Raphael to have been damaging to the interests of art.‡ Julius II. undoubtedly might have chosen loftier subjects for the walls of the third Stanza, but even Leo recognized eventually his mistake; for the fourth Stanza he suggested themes of universal historical interest and thoroughly in keeping with the place. In them, "towards the end of his career, the first of historical painters was able to employ his gifts on subjects of direct historical import, yet idealized by the lapse of time."§

If the execution of the frescoes in the Stanza del' Incendio is not to be compared with that of those in the first two Stanze, compensation is to be found in the wonderful masterpieces of the Loggie. When exception has been made of the paintings on the roof of the Sixtine Chapel and on the walls of the two Stanze, what more impressive and more appropriate subjects can be thought of than the series of episodes from the lives of the

\* KOOPMANN (*Raffaels Zeichnungen*, 312) is right in asserting that public opinion saw nothing derogatory to the artist in painting the decorations of the theatre spoken of on p. 171 *seq.* Leonardo da Vinci prided himself on his knowledge of the stage and its technique.

† ZIMMERMANN, II., 484; *cf.* 539.

‡ GNOLI, *loc. cit.* On the contrary, KRAUS (*Cambridge Mod. History*, II., 13) also says: "The protection he showed to this great master is, and always will be, Leo's best and noblest title to fame."

§ BURCKHARDT, *Cicerone*, 670.



Apostles represented by the tapestries? That the effect would have been doubled if the work had been carried out in fresco\* is true, but another question arises, whether, under such conditions, it would have fitted into the Sixtine Chapel. Further, the Pope was bound by traditional usage to employ tapestry work in the decoration of the lower walls. Under these circumstances this was the only way in which he could gain entrance for Raphael's work into the Sixtine Chapel, thus enabling him to measure his strength with that of his great rival in this most sacred spot and with him to share the palm of victory. By commissioning the work and entrusting the design to Raphael, Leo unquestionably performed a great service to art, while the cartoons form one of the brightest ornaments in the painter's crown of fame and reflect a lustre on the Pope, conferring upon him an honoured place by the side of Julius II. in the history of the Sixtine Chapel. If in other respects Leo is rightly accused of suspending the great work of the latter, here at least it must with justice be admitted that he carried out and completed his predecessor's plans. With the completion of the tapestries, the Sixtine Chapel presented, as no other spot on earth has ever done, the united homage of the two greatest painters to religion.† As Michael Angelo embodied on its ceiling in a wonderful way the history of the Old Testament, so Raphael in the

\* SPRINGER, 290.

† I wish here to give expression to the wish, also shared by Strzygowski, that His Holiness Pius X. would be pleased to direct that Raphael's tapestries, or good copies of them, should be hung in their original places. Thus, at last, would the finishing touch be given to the restoration of the Sixtine Chapel, which thus far has been carried out with such happy results; *cf.* STRZYGOWSKI in the *Kunst-chronik*, 1906-1907, No. 3, 46 *seq.*

Loggie and the tapestries became a not less noble interpreter of the Old and of the New. For these two creations the pilgrims of art, who for more than four centuries have made their way to the Vatican, have to thank the fostering care of Leo X.

The question, however, is asked whether the appointment as architect of St. Peter's was not detrimental to Raphael as a painter. The new appointment made exorbitant demands on his time, and there was imminent danger of a break being made in his career. But who can blame the Pope for having listened to the advice of a Bramante? Leo X. was justified by results. The close occupation with ancient art which the work at St. Peter's demanded, was an important factor in the further development of the painter of Urbino. Lastly, the constant participation of Raphael's pupils in the works of their overtasked master was the direct means of bestowing on the world creations instinct with the genuine secret of Raphaelesque beauty, for as long as the master lived, his pupils worked under his inspiration; nor should it be overlooked that the ever-increasing elevation of Raphael's art was conditioned by the extraordinary favour and estimation in which he was held by Leo, of whose Court he was one of the most distinguished members. Although the *Madonna di S. Sisto* and the *Transfiguration* were not painted at the Pope's own command, the latter is entitled to a certain share of credit for their composition, since it was due to Papal favour and in the Papal service that their painter made Rome his dwelling-place. In these two last pictures, each of which is, in its way, without a rival as a representation of supernatural vision, Leo X. also participates, in so far as they re-echo the note of religious feeling associated with the Council of the Lateran held under his presidency.\*

\* The above important facts have been emphasized for the first time

On looking back, it is impossible to deny that the influence of Leo on art was much more remarkable and fruitful than his influence on letters; it produced fruits worthy of the Papacy in its days of ripest culture. Before all else Raphael's cartoons are masterpieces by the side of which few things can be set of equal religious or artistic importance. Yet high as were the services rendered by Leo to art, they do not equal in value those of Julius II. The glowing enthusiasm, the great mind, belonged to Julius II. Not only as a politician, but as the friend of art, the genial Rovere far excelled the quick-witted Medici; this truth was for long disregarded, but is now borne home convincingly. At sunset on the Alps, the mountains sometimes appear suffused with a wondrous radiance, which glows with a greater beauty and splendour than the mid-day sun itself. In like manner the meridian brightness of the reign of Julius II. flung its rays over the world of art of Leo X., and thus it came to pass that the age has become identified with the name, not of the mighty Rovere, but of his more favoured successor.

by BURCKHARDT, Cicerone, 659. We shall return to this again when considering the Catholic Reformation.

## CHAPTER IX.

### THE COUNCIL OF THE LATERAN.

LEO X.'s devotion to literature and art and his keen political activity have thrown into the background, in a manner hardly befitting the history of a spiritual ruler, the efficiency of his ecclesiastical government. Nevertheless, the latter was by no means insignificant; within the first half of his reign two ecclesiastical events of the most far-reaching importance occurred: the Lateran Council and the Concordat with France. With the proceedings of the former, Leo's church policy was closely interwoven, especially with regard to his efforts towards reform.

In spite of the difficulties which beset him, Leo X. was determined to carry on and complete\* the conciliar work of his predecessor. Immediately after his accession he hastened to answer, in terms of the highest approval, the letter addressed to Julius II. by the pious Duke George of Saxony, regarding the appointment of a Procurator

\* An official but not complete collection of documents for the Transactions of the Council of the Lateran appeared at Rome in 1521. This very rare original edition (of which there is a copy in the Imperial Library, Vienna) was not used, but a later one, by Binius, Labbé, Hardouin, and also Hergenröther; see GUGLIA, *Studien*, I *seq.* Paris de Grassis gives valuable additional information (*cf.* GUGLIA, *loc cit.*, where also the other sources are mentioned). Hergenröther cannot have had access to special acta, as none such exist in the Secret Archives of the Vatican. This solves Guglia's doubt, 16. *Cf.* also MERKLE in *Histor. Jahrbuch*, XXV., 501.



at the Council. On the 11th of April, 1513, the day of his solemn occupation of the Lateran, he issued a Constitution which proclaimed his earnest intention of proceeding with the Council, and prorogued the sixth session until the 27th of April.\* There assembled twenty-two Cardinals, two Patriarchs, twelve Assistants at the Throne, sixty-two Bishops, and a detached group of thirteen Prelates, among whom were not a few who, like the ardent reforming Bishop of Chieti, Pietro Caraffa, appeared in the Council for the first time. The States of Lower Italy and the Venetian Republic were the best represented, being under the powerful protection of the Emperor, Spain, Venice, Milan, and Florence. Mario de Perusco acted as Procurator-Fiscal, the humanist Tommaso Inghirami as Secretary.† At the opening ceremony Bishop Simon Begnius of Modrussa preached on the two principal subjects before the Council, the Turkish difficulty and church reform. In an historical survey, beginning with the great Schism, he reviewed the Church's losses to the Turks, pointed out the grievous blows dealt to faith and morals in the Church, and what attempts had hitherto been made to avert the evil. Now, when freed from error, they were living in peace, the time had come to restore the head of the faith, the Roman Church, to a better position, since from the head health as well as sickness flowed down to the members. Now had come the Lion from the tribe of Juda, the Solomon whom God had raised up to deliver the daughter of Sion, the people of God, out of the hands of the persecutor and destroyer. But, urged the preacher, the assembled fathers must work together with one mind to reform the deformed, that doubt may be dispelled, faith exalted, and religion

\* Cf. RAYNALDUS, 1513, n. 19 and 20; HEFELE-HERGENRÖTHER, VIII., 558 *seq.*

† HEFELE-HERGENRÖTHER, VIII., 560 *seq.*

established: yet reform must begin with themselves, each one, and they must cleanse their own dwellings before those of others.\*

The Pope in his allocution also called upon the members of the Council to fix their attention first and foremost on the good of Christendom. At the same time he expressed his wish that the assembly might continue to sit until peace had been established in the Church. To the proposal of the Procurator of the Council, that proceedings should be taken against the absentee members, Leo did not assent; on the other hand, he publicly offered safe-conducts to all except the schismatics, and exhorted the princes to do the same. No other matters of importance were transacted in this session.†

The first thing to be done was to settle the method of procedure. In general the business of the sessions was prepared beforehand in the Consistories and then in the Papal Chancery.‡ Further, the Dean of the College of Cardinals, Raffaello Riario, proposed the formation of separate congregations which should treat beforehand with the Pope and the Sacred College. Leo was unwilling to appoint the members of these congregations himself, as his predecessor had done; he handed over the choice to the Fathers of the Council, who forthwith elected four-and-twenty Prelates by a majority of votes. The latter were subdivided into three committees, but in such a way that the Pope added to each group of eight thus chosen, eight Cardinals and four representatives for those who were

\* HEFELE-HERGENRÖTHER, VIII., 563-565. About the warning on Reform addressed by G. Cortese in 1513 to Leo X., *cf.* *Histor. Jahrbuch*, V., 326; CIAN, *loc cit.*, 425, n. 1.

† *Ibid.*, 562. Also a \*letter of Cardinal S. Gonzaga to the Marquis of Mantua, Rome, 1513, April 28. Gonzaga Archives, Mantua.

‡ *Cf.* GUGLIA, *Studien*, 33 *seq.*

absent when the votes were taken (of which representatives two for each group were Generals of religious orders). Of these committees, which sat repeatedly, the first was occupied with the restoration of peace and the healing of the Schism, the second with Curial reform, and the third with the Pragmatic Sanction and questions of faith. Much else remained over for discussion in the general congregation which was independent of the committees. In the sessions each one was free to utter his opinions on the decrees, to bring forward objections, and propose alterations. The free participation of the members in the transactions of the Council was thus fully guaranteed.\*

At the date of the seventh session (June 17, 1513) seventy-seven Bishops were already assembled, four of whom represented England, Poland, Savoy, and Ferrara. At the beginning of the sitting citations were issued by the Procurator to Poland, Masovia, Milan, and Mantua. The preacher spoke of the Turkish danger and described Leo, in terms of panegyric, as the King of Kings who wielded the two swords over the whole earth: under him, who had been as wonderfully chosen as he had been wonderfully brought out of captivity, all ought to rally together. Hereupon the Pope ordered a Bull to be read † in which he promised to send embassies of peace to the princes, and, in consideration of the growing inclination of the French to make submission, he adjourned the session until the month of November.‡ Up to this point the

\* HEFELE-HERGENRÖTHER, VIII., 565 *seq.*; *cf.* GUGLIA, Studien, 28 *seq.* HINSCHIUS, III., 524, only lays stress, in a one-sided way, on the independence of the committees of the Curia. *Cf.*, on the other hand, HEFELE-HERGENRÖTHER, VIII., 692.

† Against this Bull not only the Archbishop of Trani, but also some others, brought objections. RAYNALDUS, 1513, n. 43; GUGLIA, 9.

‡ HEFELE-HERGENRÖTHER, VIII., 570.

various committees had not been idle; the Pope, Cardinals, and Bishops were assiduous in their co-operation, and Leo only left Rome for a short time.\*

In a decree of the 20th of September the Pope defined his attitude towards the Hussites of Bohemia; concessions were held out as regards the chalice and the confiscated church property, none as regards the punishment of sinners and the license to preach.† On the 13th of October the Reform Commission broke up into five subdivisions, to each of which was assigned a special department of the Curia. A report which they had prepared dealt with the question of benefices, urged upon the members of the Papal household a worthy mode of life and corresponding seemliness in dress, and denounced exactions and other abuses.‡

Leo was meanwhile busily engaged in Consistory in preparing material for the next (the eighth) session.§ This was held on the 19th of December, 1513.|| The official entrance of the French into the Council immediately followed.¶ On this occasion the sermon was preached by a Johannite father; his main theme was the warfare of Christ, whose captain and standard-bearer Leo was; like a true physician, he was healing the ills of the Church by means of the Council, which would bring back a golden age. After a penal mandate against the French officials in Provence for encroachments on the Church had received the Papal approval, there ensued the proclamation of a Bull, destined to

\* HEFELE-HERGENRÖTHER, VIII., 576.

† Regest. Leonis X., n. 4597; THEINER, Mon. Ung., II., 610 *seq.*

‡ HEFELE-HERGENRÖTHER, VIII., 577, and 810 *seq.*

§ SANUTO, XVII., 398.

|| HEFELE-HERGENRÖTHER, VIII., 579 *seq.*; GUGLIA, 20.

¶ Cf. Vol. VII. of this work, p. 71.



be famous, which was directed against a one-sided and erroneous philosophy.

The three condemned propositions were : that the human soul is mortal ; that one soul is common to all men ; that the truth of this assertion holds good at least in philosophy.\* The propositions thus condemned aimed at a tendency of thought which threatened to destroy all positive Christianity, and which, having started from a false mediæval philosophy, culminated in that of the 18th century, and partially survives at the present day. Further, they had come into conjunction with that erroneous side of the Renaissance in which classical, cabbalistic, and rationalist elements were linked together in a strange alliance. The first two propositions were specially defended by the Paduan Professor, Pietro Pomponazzi, who avowed himself to be a disciple of the new peripatetic school which had arisen along with the Arabic recension of Aristotle by Averroës. Even if the controversial defence of his views was not put into writing until a later date, and no recantation was demanded of him until 1518,† yet he had before that denied the complete individual immortality of the soul. The question at issue was the great problem of individuality which had already occupied the thought of the Middle Ages, and had come to a point with the growth of nominalism. Even the theory of "twofold truth" had already sprung up in the schools of the 12th century logicians, had found aliment in nominalism, and had crept into the philosophy of Nicholas of Cusa. This teaching caused an artificial breach between philosophy and theology, between dogma and reason, which was to be

\* Bull. V., 601 *seq.* Cf. DITTRICH, Contarini, 220 ; HEFELE-HERGENRÖTHER, VIII., 585 *seq.* ; DANIEL, Étud. class., 226 *seq.*, and V. TIZZANI, I Concilii Lateranesi, Roma, 1878, 578 *seq.*

† Cf. Vol. V. of this work, p. 157.

widened by the impress of the future rationalism. In relation to this development the decision of the Council had a special importance. It was dogmatically affirmed, in agreement with the earlier pronouncements of the Council of Vienne, that the soul is the "*forma corporis*," that each man has an individual soul, and that every assertion contrary to the truth, as contained in the faith, is false. These definitions supplied a standard which was as important as it was necessary; to a certain extent they relieved Leo from responsibility for those who were open to the charge of anti-Christian extravagances, and whose tastes and interests he nevertheless shared in other respects and to a great extent encouraged.\*

At the same time the Bull was a practical weapon against the inroads which a paganized humanism was making among the clergy, for the University professors were directed to give a foremost place to what is now called apologetic theology, and priests who were desirous of following the humanist curriculum were enjoined to complete a five years' course of theology or canon law as the most effectual breakwater to oppose to a false philosophy. Even in the Council-hall itself the atmosphere of the new ideas seems to have made itself felt; thus the objection raised by the Bishop of Bergamo had a tinge of the condemned propositions. The general of the Dominicans, Cajetan, pleaded for a freer treatment of philosophy, because, apparently, he dreaded an intermixture of this science with theology.†

During this important session measures were also proposed for the best means of restoring peace to Christendom,

\* BENRATH in Herzogs Real-Enzyklopädie, X., 3rd ed., 388. His opinion, that Leo was thus released from all responsibility, is somewhat too favourable to the Pope.

† HEFELE-HERGENRÖTHER, VIII., 587.

for the inauguration of a Crusade, and for the reconciliation of the Bohemians to the Church. Finally, a regulation for the reform of the Curia was brought forward which made great reductions in taxation and was directed against other official abuses. It was far from giving satisfaction, however, to those who wished for more sweeping reforms. This dissatisfaction often found expression in the Council. Paris de Grassis, Bishop of Pesaro, exclaimed: "I am for a general reformation, including that of the reformers themselves"; whereupon the Pope replied, with a touch of humour, that "he would think the matter over, and see how he could satisfy everybody."\*

How wide were the differences of opinion on the question of reform, how great the conflict of opposing interests, is shown clearly in the following transactions. The Bishops were separated from the religious orders by divisions as great as those which separated them from the Cardinals, and the work of the Council was thus impeded. The Pope had to appear in person in the general congregation and exhort to a more brotherly gentleness. When several Bishops refused to give their assent to the draft introduced by the Cardinals, Leo praised them, and said laughingly that they were cleverer than he, since no one was more bound by his obligations to the Cardinals than he was.†

The ninth session was not held until the 5th of May, 1514. Once more the private chaplain, Antonio Pucci, in the customary sermon at the beginning of the sitting, exhorted those present, and especially the Pope, to keep to the work of church reform, since it was the Council's

\* Paris de Grassis in RAYNALDUS, 1513, n. 97; HEFELE-HERGENRÖTHER, VIII., 588; GUGLIA, 10. For the "quasi subridens," see also JUNGSMANN, *Dissert. eccl.*, VI. (1886), 465 *seq.*

† RAYNALDUS, 1514, n. 15-16.

duty to inquire into disorders and remove them. Scathing was his description of the moral degradation into which the laity, the orders, and the clergy had sunk. The upshot, accordingly, of the session was the acceptance of a very stringent Bull on the reform of Church and Curia.\*

The first part insisted on the appointment of fit persons to bishoprics and abbatial posts in accordance with canon law, regulated commissions and the consistorial procedure, put a check on deprivations and translations, forbade the pernicious system of "in commendam," and restricted the union of benefices, dispensations, and reservations; whoever, after four years, was still in possession of four livings, was to be deprived of all. The second part dealt with the Cardinals, their mode of life, their surroundings, their households, their functions, their titular churches and commends, their position towards their relations, their legateships, their residential and discretionary duties. The prescriptions for the members of a Cardinal's household applied also to the Papal and Curial retainers. The last section of the Bull aimed at the religious and moral elevation of the priesthood and of the laity: the religious instruction of the young was to be duly carried out, heavy penalties were assigned to blasphemers and to incontinent, negligent and simoniacal priests, church revenues were no longer to be confiscated, the privileges of the clergy were to be observed, all kinds of superstition abolished and all impostors, passing as Christians, to be prosecuted, especially at the Papal Court. We can see that in this document a whole legion of abuses was attacked. The necessity for such a step met with general recognition; the Bull was accepted by an overwhelming majority—130 votes against 10; nor was the opposition made with any great show of

\* Bull. V., 604 *seq.*, Regest Leonis X., n. 8495. In HEFELE-HERGENRÖTHER, VIII., 602, a thorough analysis of the contents.



conviction.\* Searching as the Bull appeared to be, yet it did not go far enough. In many instances it stopped short with half measures; what was still worse, most of its prescriptions remained on paper and were never put into practice.

It was not long before symptoms appeared in the Council which made it evident that the hopes of a radical restoration of the Church to its pristine integrity must be abandoned. Throughout the remainder of the sessions the attention of the Fathers was engrossed by the scandalous strife between the Bishops and Regulars. This unholy quarrel had lasted for centuries; it had been a source of the greatest weakness and discredit to the Church, but never before had the waters of controversy risen so high as now. The Episcopate was gathering together all its strength to make an end, once and for all, of the privileges, especially the *Mare Magnum*,† which thwarted its action at every step; in spite of their utmost resistance, the Regulars threatened to succumb, a situation which would have entailed incalculable results. "We are in the heart of a terrific storm," relates the General of the Augustinians, Egidio Canisio. "The attack upon us and all the mendicant orders by the Bishops in the Lateran Council has now raged furiously for three years. During this period we have had no rest, no truce; day by day we have been subjected to examination, day by day we have been summoned, sometimes to listen to our accusers, sometimes to plead our cause. Now our appeal is to the Holy Father, now to the Cardinal Protector, now to other Cardinals, now to the Ambassadors of the princes; first on this hand and then on that we turn for counsel, help, and

\* Paris de Grassis in RAYNALDUS, 1514, n. 36; cf. GUGLIA, 10-11. SANUTO, XVIII., 182-183, also shows clearly how general in Rome was the conviction of the necessity of a reform of the clergy.

† See Vol. IV. of this work, 389.

support.”\* Leo X. himself was unwilling to check the free course of things by flinging into the scales, as his predecessor had done, the whole weight of his apostolic authority, from which alone the monastic orders could still receive support ; a proceeding which Egidio ascribes solely to the mildness and gentleness of the Pope’s character.

As in the contest between the Bishops and the Cardinals, Leo’s policy consisted in an adroit mediation between the two parties, with each of whom he liked to treat separately. With regard to the misuse by the Minorites of the right to proclaim the Indulgence of St. Peter’s, he sanctioned a compromise with the Bishops.† When he also, towards the end of the Council, agreed that the two points on which the monks were most sensitive—exemptions and freedom from taxation—should no longer be interfered with, it was on the distinct understanding, by which he held fast, that in other matters they should be compliant. To this impartial attitude towards the contending parties it is mainly due that the practical result of the controversy was an earnest determination on the part of the monastic orders, thus brought to bay, to undertake their own reform and to enforce strongly the observance of their rules.‡

On both sides the debate was carried on with great ability. The Bishops’ attacks were levelled in the first place at the vicious lives of many of the Regulars and then at their encroachments on the cure of souls and the constituted jurisdiction. The Orders replied in their defence with eloquence and much dialectical skill, laying great stress on the superiority of the Pope over the Council, and

\* MARTÈNE-DURAND, III., 1262 ; *cf.* HEFELE-HERGENRÖTHER, VIII., 692 *seq.* See also p. 251 *nn.*, the quotation from PÉLISSIER ; *De opere Aegid. Vit.*, 43.

† *Cf.* HEFELE-HERGENRÖTHER, VIII., 622 *seq.*, 637 *seq.*

‡ *Ibid.*, 622, 767 *seq.*

making fiery appeals to the "sagacious piety of their Papal protector." The chief object of their defence was cleverly to cause division among their opponents by a reference to the considerable number of Bishops who were not in agreement with the proposals of their colleagues. The complaints of relaxed monastic discipline they strove to neutralize by calling attention to scandals in the Episcopate and among the parochial clergy. "Before you call upon us to observe the laws of right common to man, see that you observe them yourselves," they exclaimed to their antagonists. On the other hand, the religious orders did not omit to set forth their services to Christian people, especially their assiduity in preaching and in hearing confessions. In Italy especially, which was the chief seat of opposition, had it not been for the Regulars, the name of Christ would hardly have escaped oblivion, so few Italians were there, outside the cloister, who had any knowledge of theology. No enticements, they further insisted, had kept them back, no danger had dismayed them from visiting hostile lands, confronting princes, and exposing their bodies to ill-usage in order to defend the See of Peter and the Council of the Lateran: and was that same Council now to bring its own champions to ruin! Yet another point of view was turned to account. "Those who are hankering after the great wealth of the Church will, in order to avoid the suspicion of acting as the enemies of religion, as soon as they hear that the monastic orders have been attacked and worsted by the Bishops, see an excellent and creditable opportunity for taking up the cause of the former, which previously they would not have done out of goodwill."\*

\* The *Petitiones praelatorum a S. D. N. Leone X. contra Regulares* and the *Supplicatio pro parte et nomine omnium religiosorum*, as well as the *Responsiones fratrum*, have been published by HERGENRÖTHER, VIII., 813, 814 *seq.*, and 818 *seq.*, from the Vatican Archives.

A suspension but not a conclusive settlement of this embittered controversy was reached in the tenth session of the Council, on the 4th of May, 1515. Once again the call for reform rang from the pulpit. The knowledge, declared the Archbishop of Patras, how to effect a swift reform of the whole Church, belonged to the Apostolic See alone. If the all-embracing authority of the Pontiff were more cordially supported by the combined members of the Episcopate, fewer contraventions of the Church's law would be possible. But, as already four patriarchal churches had been severed from the body, so he also who sat on Peter's chair could not escape judgment if he did not obey his eternal Judge. Great was the danger that yet other portions of Christendom would be lost through disobedience to God and the Holy See. Therefore, Pope and Council must work together for the true reform and regeneration of Christendom.\*

A single Bull† comprised the enactments relating to the limitation of exemptions, the strengthening of the Bishops' authority, and the maintenance of ecclesiastical liberties. Of importance was the transference, in the case of negligence on the part of the special visitor, of suits against exempts to the Bishop, who was to sit as judge-delegate with apostolic powers; this provision was again adopted by the Council of Trent; the episcopal privilege of visiting convents, in immediate obedience to the Pope, once a year, was renewed, also the refusal to allow an appeal to Rome in matters concerning benefices pending the judgment in the Bishop's court. The Bishops were ordered to hold provincial and diocesan synods, the former every three years, with the participation of the exempts. This institution, which was to have such a wholesale influence

\* HEFELE-HERGENRÖTHER, VIII., 642 *seq.*

† *Ibid.*, 646 *seq.*



on church reform, was also one of the measures anticipated by the Lateran Council.

Of not less capital importance were two other decrees passed in this session. The first gave sanction to the pawnshops or Monti di Pietà, which had been called into existence as a protection for the necessitous poor against extortionate interest on loans. As a matter of fact these agencies, introduced into Italy under Pius II., had already been recommended by many strictly orthodox preachers, and had in many instances received Papal approbation.\* This was the first occasion on which the payment of interest was recognized as permissible in theory. Leo recalls the theological and juridical controversies on the subject, and pronounces, in view of his obligations to support useful and modern institutions, that such loan-offices are to be recommended; all who teach the contrary are excommunicate. He evidently regards the Monti which lend without interest as the more deserving.†

The influence of the second constitution on the new era that had dawned was trenchant and purifying.‡ The power of the printing press had surpassed all expectations and was proving in many cases a blessed, and in many cases a baneful, gift to man. In highly enthusiastic terms the Pope celebrates the benefits to mankind and the Church conferred through "the favour of heaven" by this discovery which had come down as a gift from God to earth. By means of printing everyone for little money can buy many books, the study of gifted minds is made

\* Cf. Vol. V. of this work, 109 *seq.*

† Bull. V., 622. Cf. HOLZAPFEL, *Die Anfänge der Montes pietatis*, München, 1903, 12, 129 *seq.*

‡ Bull. V., 625 *seq.* Cf. REUSCH, *Index*, I., 55 *seq.*; FESSLER, *Kirchl. Bücherverbot*, Wien, 1858, 51 *seq.*; *ibid.*, *Schriften*, 149 *seq.*; HAUSMANN, *Päpstl. Reservatfälle*, 113; LEA, III., 614.

easy. Catholic scholars too (and the Catholic Church prays that they may be many) can be educated thereby and thus win over unbelievers to the truth. But in different countries many masters of this new craft misuse it by the circulation of works containing errors of faith and attacks on persons in high station, which are not only unedifying to their readers, but injurious to their religious and moral life, as experience has shown and in the time to come will show more clearly still. But the Head of the Church must take heed that that which was invented for God's glory, for the exaltation of the faith, and for the diffusion of art and learning, does not become a curse instead of a blessing, and endanger the salvation of the faithful, that the good seed and the cockle, the medicine and the poison, are not mingled together. Therefore the Pope forbids, with the approval of the Council, under pain of excommunication and of heavy fines, the printing of any book without the approbation of the Bishop and the Inquisitor, and in Rome of the Cardinal Vicar and the Master of the Palace. Every book printed contrary to these regulations shall be burned.

Yet another weighty question had been reserved for decision in this session: the reform of the Calendar.\* At the beginning of his reign Leo had bestowed much attention on this important subject as on so many other scientific inquiries. In February, 1514, he had invited the learned scholar, Paul von Middelburg,† the author of an

\* Besides KALTENBRUNNER, *Sitzungsberichte d. Wiener Akad.*, LXXXII., 375 *seq.*, *cf.* now MARZI, *La quest. di riforma del Calendario nel quinto Concilio Lateranense*, Firenze, 1896; *Atti d. Congresso stor. internaz. di Roma*, III., 642 *seq.* For the summons of J. Ziegler to Rome in connection with the reform of the Calendar, see KALKOFF in *Archiv für Reformationsgeschichte*, III., 68.

† MARZI, 39 *seq.*, 53 *seq.*, treats fully of him and his treatise *Paulina*.

exhaustive treatise on the computation of Easter, to Rome; in July, 1514, special letters had been addressed to the Universities of Europe and to the leading princes requesting them to send reports on the reform of the Calendar to Rome.\* Answers were received from Vienna, Tübingen, Louvain, and Ingoldstadt.† In Italy Antonio Dolciati, Raggio, Giovanni Maria Tolosani, Antonio Albizzi, Basilio Lapi, and Cipriano Beneti dedicated writings on this topic to the Pope.‡ The opinions, however, were so divergent that Leo had to withdraw the question, as not yet ripe for discussion, from the agenda of the tenth session. But he did not on this account dismiss the matter altogether. A special commission made most careful scrutiny of the reports forwarded, and made use of them in the preparation of new proposals which were to serve as the foundation for a further treatment of the question. These propositions were sent in July, 1516, to many princes, bishops, and universities, with the request that fresh reports should be sent in or scholars despatched to Rome to confer.§ No decision on the matter, however, was then reached;|| nor was this the fault of Leo X.: on the contrary, his exertions on behalf of the reform of the

\* MANSI, *Suppl. ad Concilia*, VI., 708 *seq.* Cf. WIEDEMANN, *Eck*, 457 *seq.*; MARZI, 34 *seq.*, 76 *seq.* The Letters to the Emperor (MARZI, *loc. cit.*), to Henry VIII. (in RYMER, VI., 1, 119 *seq.*, and ROSCOE, X., 232 *seq.*), to the King of Portugal (*Corp. Dipl. Port.*, I., 379 *seq.*), to Venice (original in Venetian State Archives, Bolle), to Florence (*Mitteil. d. Oesterr. Instituts*, II., 623 *seq.*; cf. XIII., 329 *seq.*), are by Sadoletto, and identical.

† Cf. KALTENBRUNNER, *loc. cit.*, 386 *seq.*

‡ Cf. MARZI, 114 *seq.*, 124 *seq.*, 134 *seq.*, 157 *seq.* For the letter of C. Beneti, not here mentioned, see MARINI, *Lettera*, 22. For Tolosani, see also MARZI in the *Miscell. stor. d. Valdelsa*, V., 1.

§ MARZI, 185 *seq.*

|| Cf. KALTENBRUNNER, 396; MARZI, 199 *seq.*, 209 *seq.*

Calendar form a pleasing episode in the history of his Pontificate.\*

After the leading measures of importance had been settled in the tenth session, the adjournment of the Council until the end of the following year became possible. The interval was filled with political agitation, the conclusion of the Concordat with France, the negotiations with the Eastern churches—all things which diverted men's minds from the Council as the centre of interest.

A project fraught with danger to the constitution of the Church, but in which many of the fathers of the Council were then implicated, must not pass unnoticed. The latter formed the idea of uniting themselves more closely in a fraternal sodality for the purpose of safeguarding their common interests.† This confraternity, which was to be represented by a standing committee, was directed in the first instance against the regular clergy. But how easily might this have developed by an inevitable sequence into a sort of oligarchical constitution, and have led, through a system of episcopalianism, to the weakening of the apostolical authority? That this was foreseen by the Curia is shown by the reply to the twelve points which the Bishops advanced on behalf of their *sodalitium*.‡ At the head of all stood the statement that "the Pope is Bishop of the Universal Church, and has, in the first place, the oversight of the collective churches committed to him." But this proposition means nothing else than that the individual churches would be better governed, and the rights of their diocesans more strictly defended, by bishops with plenipotentiary powers than by the Pope, who,

\* Judgment of DEL LUNGO in Arch. stor. Ital., 5th Series, XVIII., 435.

† HEFELE-HERGENRÖTHER, VIII., 847 *seq.*

‡ Published by HERGENRÖTHER, VIII., 847 *seq.*



along with the Sacred College, cares best for the interests of the Church. "If the violator of episcopal rights cannot be kept within bounds by the majesty of the Roman Bishop and the most sacred General Council, is it likely that he will allow himself to be bridled by the efforts of a couple of bishops who are the deputies of an association?" Let the inferior clergy once attempt to obtain permission from the Pope and Council to set up associations of this sort in the Bishop's own city, and it will very soon become plain what the object of such an attempt is.\*

The danger of the situation did not escape the Pope; the Cardinals were against the scheme from the beginning, as one that would only give rise to divisions among the Bishops.† Leo X. told the envoys of the Bishops in plain language that if they insisted on their demands, he would postpone the next session from year to year, and in the meantime maintain the privilege of the monastic orders to the fullest extent; the Bishops Assistant at the Papal throne sufficed to bring before him the wishes of their colleagues in the Episcopate. The Bishops now begged the Pope to grant them leave to hold meetings for the discussion of their affairs and to have a special fund of their own, also that he would appoint as assistants at the throne some prelates not of Italian birth. Leo was not indisposed to grant the last request, but he thought the establishment of a special fund superfluous. He returned the petition and ordered the Cardinals to make a thorough examination of all writings for and against the scheme. After these had given their opinion, the unanimous verdict of the Consistory was declared: that the interests of the

\* By such a comparison of the subordination of the Bishop to the constituted jurisdiction with that of the delegated minister of souls, the memorialists overshot their mark.

† Paris de Grassis in RAYNALDUS, 1516, n. 1 *seq.*

VOL. VIII.

Episcopate had been largely cared for by the canon law and by certain decrees of the existing Council; if any things remained over, the Pope and Cardinals were more competent to settle them than any *sodalitium*. It was made plain to the petitioners that they must accept as their answer that which, under like circumstances, they would have given to their own clergy.\* That in this way, on the eve of the disruption of Christendom, a decentralizing tendency should have been arrested, marks a victory of the monarchical principle on which Christ founded His Church, the importance of which is not to be lightly prized.

These disagreements had taken up so much time that the eleventh session could not assemble before the 19th of December, 1516. The preliminary general congregation (on December 15th) had witnessed the appearance of the first American member of the Council, Bishop Alessandro Gerardini of San Domingo, who nine years later, after a life of assiduous literary labour, died in the odour of sanctity.† The eleventh session also saw the visit of three envoys from the Maronites, who came to offer obedience. They presented a letter of homage from their Patriarch, Simon Peter, dated the 14th of February, 1515, which was at once read to the assembly. In the previous year a representative of the Patriarch had already visited Rome. His arrival was closely followed by a letter in which the latter, after certain dogmatic and liturgical discussions,

\* HEFELE-HERGENRÖTHER, VIII., 695 *seq.*, 702.

† See UGHELLI, VIII., 292 *seq.*; ZENO, Diss. Voss., II., 231; HEFELE-HERGENRÖTHER, VIII., 703, and the journal *Il Muratori*, I., 177 *seq.*, 215 *seq.*, 259 *seq.*, II., 103 *seq.* The diplomatic missions of Gerardini deserve closer investigation. To his Russian mission belongs the \**Oratio Alex. Gerardini episcopi coram rege Russiae habita*, in Cod. Q 3, 18, of the Angelica Library, Rome.

requested the Pope to ratify his position, and to confer upon him Papal marks of distinction and other favours ; he also invited his mediation in the affairs of the Maronites in Cyprus and Venice. This new embassy was the result of the conciliatory letters which Leo had sent to the Patriarch and his flock for purposes of instruction, and to the guardian of the Minorites at Beyrout. The Patriarch thanked the successor of St. Peter for his costly gifts and for the instruction tendered through his envoy on the subjects of the chrism, the deferment of baptism, the sacrament of marriage, ordinations, the words of consecration, the procession of the Holy Ghost, purgatory, confession, and Easter Communion. The Pope gave a cordial assent to the Patriarch's requests in accordance with the assurance he had given him in August. The correspondence between Leo and the Emperor of Æthiopia, David III., which was carried on at the same time, was less productive of results.\* The Russians also remained outside the Roman influence : that they were not, at anyrate, neglected is shown by the report which the Archbishop of Gnesen prepared for the ninth session on the errors of the Ruthenians in White and Red Russia.†

The eleventh session, which was of especial importance as regards the establishment of the Concordat with France and the repeal of the Pragmatic Sanction, was also occupied with questions affecting the pastoral work of the Church. In a constitution, which was passed unanimously and was exceedingly well timed, the leading principles were laid down of a system of preaching calculated to bring forth

\* HEFELE-HERGENRÖTHER, VIII., 681 *seq.*, gives further information concerning the dealings with the Christians of the East. Cf. also KUNSTMANN in the Tüb. Quartalschr., 1845.

† HEFELE-HERGENRÖTHER, VIII., 688 *seq.* ; RAYNALDUS, 1514, n. 67-86.

fruitful results. Starting from the necessity for a united and authoritative ministry of preaching, the constitution began by setting forth how many preachers, unmindful of their mission and often contrary to the spirit of the Apostles and Fathers, sought only their own reputation, flattered the multitude, seduced their hearers from the truth, misinterpreted Holy Scripture, prophesied falsely, indulged in personal abuse, weakened the authority of the Church, and set an example of violent and senseless zeal. For the future, accordingly, none were to be allowed to preach who had not first been tested by the authorities and had given proof of competency. Each one was to be satisfied with preaching the pure Gospel according to the interpretation of the Fathers, and to refrain from prophesying the time of the evils to come. God, it cannot be denied, reveals in extraordinary ways the destinies of the Church: but, since all spirits cannot be trusted, matters of private revelation ought, before they are divulged, to be submitted to the judgment of the Holy See, or, if the case is urgent, to that of the Bishop. In case of disobedience to this ruling the offender shall be deprived of his license to preach, and come under excommunication. These extremely opportune restrictions were applied to a widespread mischief to which, as the constitution declared, the pulpit was, from its very nature, exposed; the superstitious belief in apocalyptic messages, the prevalence of unlicensed preachers and persons claiming to have a mission from God, were used as powerful weapons against the authority of the Church.\*

It was also of advantage to the pastoral office that in this same session certain limits were drawn, so far as the

\* HEFELE-HERGENRÖTHER, VIII., 707. Cf. *Hist. Jahrb.*, V., 339 *seq.*, and PAULUS, Hoffmeister, 45. For the condition of the pulpit at that time, see the literature given by FLAMINI, 573.



still open question of the privileges of the religious orders permitted, between the secular and the regular clergy. To the Bishops were given the power of visitation over clergy belonging to religious orders, the examination of candidates for holy orders, the conferring of ordination, and much besides ; the dispensation of the Sacraments and the administration of burial were, in the case of the regular clergy, accompanied by certain specified limitations, and mutual respect and charity were enjoyed on both parties.\* On this occasion also the session closed with the *Te Deum*. After that Leo spent some time, with marks of deep devotion, in the baptistery of S. Giovanni in Fonte, adjoining the Lateran basilica, the oldest baptismal chapel in Rome. His prayers were a thanksgiving, for, with the abolition of the Pragmatic Sanction, the Holy See had won a momentous victory after passing through many a stormy time.†

The strained condition of politics decided the Pope to take into consideration the early closing of the Council. The Emperor was, on the whole, in favour of its prolongation, but the vehemence with which he had expressed his wishes, seems to have been the direct cause of its immediate dissolution. The question came up for discussion in Consistory on the 1st of February, 1517. Cardinal Grimani made a determined opposition,‡ but Leo X. would not give way. On the 4th of March, in a protracted Consistory, the decision was taken. According to the Venetian Envoy, the fear of the Emperor's interference weighed so strongly in the scales that it was definitely settled that the Council

\* HEFELE-HERGENRÖTHER, VIII., 714 *seq.*

† MAURENBRECHER, *Kath. Ref.*, 109 ; HINSCHIUS, III., 425.

‡ "El Cardinal di Grimani oppugnò quantum potuit," says the \*Report in cipher of Gabbioneta to the Marquis of Mantua, in which this Consistory is mentioned. Gonzaga Archives, Mantua.

should forthwith be closed.\* The motion, which, along with three draft decrees, was placed before the Council, in the name of the Cardinals, on the 13th of March, also met at first with opposition, and a fresh summons of the Bishops was called for. At last, however, all, with the exception of the Bishops of Imola and Salamanca, expressed their concurrence, which encouraged the hope that, as soon as peace should be restored to Christendom, the prelates who had hitherto been prevented from attending, would participate in much greater numbers. The Governor of Rome, on his own account, expressed a wish that marriages privately contracted should be disallowed, as was later effected by the Council of Trent.†

Shortly before the close of the Council, Gianfrancesco Pico della Mirandola delivered before the Pope and the assembled fathers his remarkable speech on the reform of morals, in which he drew a frightful picture of existing conditions among the clergy. Pico confines his demands within the narrowest compass; he only asks that the priesthood shall not be altogether as salt that has lost its savour. He does not even require that they should be men of learning, so long as they at least understand the duties of their office; he does not call upon them to do penance and mortify their bodies in the manner of a Jerome or a Benedict, but at least to withdraw their presence from voluptuous banquets and to refrain from

\* *Heri matina fu concistoro et stette fino a hore 20 passate et hanno tratato di serar il concilio; la causa è perche lo imperatore ha scritto di qui che per modo alcuno non si habbi a serar detto concilio et questi per temer li imperiali andamenti hanno deliberato di terminar esso concilio come è detto perche hanno opinion che altri chel pontefice non possino chiamare el concilio.* \*Letter of Minio, date Rome, 1517, March 5, "to be kept secret." State Archives, Venice.

† *Cf.* HERGENRÖTHER, VIII., 853 *seq.*, the report of Cardinal Pucci, published for the first time.

decking their concubines with precious stones ; he would rather have them clothe the naked with their garments, as did Martin, than cover their horses and mules with costly trappings ; he wishes to see the Houses of God no longer like hovels or stables, while the dwellings of His priests glitter with gold and are spread with purple. From Leo, who had mounted to the summit of priestly dignity, not, as many supposed, by evil arts and shameful intrigues, he had hoped better things. "If we are to win back the enemy and the apostate to our faith, it is of more consequence to us that we should restore fallen morality to its ancient rule of virtue than that we should sweep with our fleet the Euxine Sea." It is the Pope's task to quell the grievous intestine strife, to bar the way against wickedness, to stem by strict continence of life the luxury, the ambition, the greed, the self-indulgence, the corrupt practices of the clergy. His it is to demand restitution of the squandered property of the Church, to chastise or remove the guilty, to abolish the accumulation of ecclesiastical offices ; for "the so-called dispensations had had the effect of conferring not many, nor a plurality, but a very host of benefices on men who were not worthy even to receive the office of a deacon." Ceremonies also and daily offices called for revision, and "true historical narrative ought to be separated from apocryphal fable." Thus would the Pope rescue the Church from destruction and win for himself not a fleeting but a permanent renown. If, however, reform was neglected, heavy and searching would be the judgment which would visit the Church.\* In his speech, which preceded the final sitting of the Council on the 16th of March, 1517, Bishop Massimo Corvino of Isernia spoke in the same sense but in tones of greater encouragement. He acknowledged how much the

\* See Vol. VII. of this work, p. 5 *seq.*



clergy owed to the Church, but also how much the Church was indebted to the clergy. In their combat with the disloyalty and wickedness among Christians who, unthankful towards God and His Church, placed the wisdom of the heathen before the wisdom of Christ, they urged a return to the Gospel, which contained the only true wisdom and was the well-spring of right knowledge and every virtue. In this way, after the example of the Apostles, the Church should be protected and adorned with might, grace, and freedom and restored to its authority and dignity. The orator saw in the teaching of the Council the whole mind of heaven, of Christ, and of the Spirit.\* Nevertheless, the gravity of the situation could not be dissembled under such fair-sounding phrases.

In this twelfth and final session of the Council on the 16th of March, there were present, besides the Pope and eighteen Cardinals, three Patriarchs, thirteen Assistants at the Throne, ten Archbishops, sixty-four Bishops, and six heads of religious orders, while Germany, Spain, Portugal, Venice, Mantua, and Bologna sent their representatives. The programme announced by Leo was approved. Only one Bull remained to be published; it was directed against the disorderly custom of the Roman populace in breaking into and looting the houses of the Cardinals during a vacancy in the Holy See. The Patriarch of Aquileia then read out the Bull imposing a tithe for three years for the Turkish wars; this having been confirmed, the Council proceeded to close. After a short review of the history and purpose of the assembly, the chief tasks with which it had been engaged were recited: the Schism had been ended, the disputes among the princes were being brought near a settlement, the congregations had finished their work, the Bishops were desirous of returning

\* HARDOUIN, 1852-1856; HEFELE-HERGENRÖTHER, VIII., 727 *seq.*



to their dioceses; the Pope ratified the decisions of the Council and would give heed to their being carried out. He forbade any alterations in them without special permission, and dismissed the members of the Council. The majority gave their "placet," only the titular Bishop of Krain (Granea), who also on other occasions appears as leader of opposition,\* spoke against the dissolution. After the Te Deum and the Pontifical blessing, Leo X. returned with great pomp to the Vatican.†

Was the closing of the fifth Council of the Lateran really premature, as so many have asserted, in view of the tempest which broke loose in the following autumn? In answering this question, attention has been justly called to the hopeless prospects of a really larger attendance at the Council, to the insistent demand of many of the princes for the return of the members, to the threats of war, and the unsettled condition of Italy.‡ Certainly all this weighed in the scale, as well as Leo's fear of intervention and uncertainty as to the part the Emperor would take. But it cannot be denied that, as far as securing practical reform was concerned, there was very little else that could have been done. Most of the enactments were only old regulations in a more stringent form, while the needs of the Church called for measures of a much more decisive

\* See GUGLIA in the Mitteil. der österr. Instituts, XXI., 536 seq.

† Bull. V., 650 seq.; RAYNALDUS, 1517, n. 9-15; GUGLIA, II; HEFELE-HERGENRÖTHER, VIII., 730 seq., also p 735 for the vehement attacks (especially on the part of gallicans) on the œcumenicity of the Lateran Council, in which, among others, even KNÖPFLE (472) and HEINER (Kirchenrect, I., 68) take part. Cf. also BAUER, 230 seq., and the opinion of the "Old Catholic," LANGEN in the Theol. Litteraturbl., 1876, Nr. 10. An original copy of the Bull *Constituti juxta verbum prophetæ*, with leaden seal attached, is in the Archives of S. Angelo, Arm. VIII., caps. 2.

‡ HEFELE-HERGENRÖTHER, VIII., 732.

character. If so far the Lateran Council fell short of a root-and-branch reform, yet it produced many laws of a most opportune character on which the Council of Trent was afterwards able to enlarge and improve. But the exaltation of the Primacy gave to this Council, even in the field of practical action, a much higher importance than the Synods of Constance and Basle, with their many reforming decrees, were able to reach. The decrees of the Lateran Council contain besides such ample reforms that the whole moral and religious condition of the clergy and laity in Rome and Christendom might have been elevated by them.\* But of what avail were all these laws if they were allowed to remain a dead letter? In this respect, unfortunately, the omissions were many.

The reform decrees of the Council were despatched far and wide, but only in Spain and Portugal, and in some parts of Italy, were they practically administered,† but even there only partially;‡ the example set by the Roman Curia stood in the way of reform. In spite of the conciliar decrees, the gross abuse of giving benefices and church dignities to children in the fullest sense of the word continued.§ Candidates with good recommendations were

\* Cf. DITTRICH in Hist. Jahrb., V., 342 *seq.*

† For Portugal, cf. Corp. Dipl. Port., I., 397; for Spain, see *infra*, p. 412.

‡ In Savoy, *e.g.*, cf. \*Brief of Leo to Duke Charles, dated Rome, 1515, May 27, in which the Bishops are called on to reform their clergy. State Archives, Turin, MAZZO, XIX., n. 10. For Leo's conventual reforms in Venice, 1519, see Libri commemor., VI., 158; cf. 165, 168.

§ A shocking example in Regest. Leonis X., n. 9097: Leo X. recommends, on May 27, 1514, the Patriarch of Venice to give a canonry in commendam to Ioh. Baptist. de Sociis, infanti Venetiarum, and to hand it over to him when he shall have reached the age of eight years and been found worthy!

dispensed from the laws, which prescribed that no one should be raised to the Episcopate who had not fully attained his twenty-seventh year ; children continued, as before, to hold the highest ecclesiastical offices, even the Cardinalate.\* In like manner the scandalous pluralism of benefices† and the obnoxious system of “in commendam”‡ remained almost unaltered, even in the Roman Curia itself. If, in consequence of the decrees passed in the ninth session, many resignations of livings were tendered by the Cardinals, “yet, on the whole, these decrees failed to be observed.” Laxity of discipline and indolence were far too deeply rooted!§ Leo X. himself, in particular cases, repeatedly disregarded the enactments of the Council.|| No wonder that the unprincipled among the Bishops, especially the large number who had not even appeared at the Council, should have gone on in their accustomed way, without a twinge of conscience. An honourable exception was Cardinal Giulio de’ Medici, the Archbishop of Florence, who endeavoured forthwith, by the holding of a provincial council (1517–1518) to give practical effect to the rulings of the

\* Alfonso, Infant of Portugal, was declared, in a Brief of July 26, 1515, capable of holding a Bishopric or Archbishopric when in his fifteenth year, in express contravention of the decrees of the Lateran Council. The Brief in Cod. XI., F 4, of the National Library, Naples, and in the Corp. Dipl. Port., I., 352, is wanting in Hergenröther’s Register.

† Cf. Vol. VII. of this work, p. 203, for Passerini. For the benefices of the Cardinal L. d’Aragona, see PASTOR, Reise des Kard. L. d’Aragona, 10.

‡ See *supra*, p. 135 n., the quotation from a French Cistercian abbot. Cf. also Stud. aus dem Benediktinerorden, 1890, 584, 596.

§ HEFELE-HERGENRÖTHER, VIII., 733.

|| Already, on Sept. 20, 1515, we find a Papal injunction in favour of Wilhelm von Enckenvoirt, releasing him from the conciliar decrees against pluralities. Regest. Leonis X., n. 17716.

Lateran.\* Ximenes took the same course in Spain, as did also Christoph von Stadion, Bishop of Augsburg, and Konrad III. von Thüngen, Prince Bishop of Würzburg.†

In Rome Leo certainly allowed the civic officials to insist, especially within the boundaries of the city, on the observance of the decrees of the Council, but the proceedings were not carried out in a thorough way. The authorities were satisfied with half measures and external observance;‡ although, especially at the beginning of the German revolt, far-seeing men urged the removal at least of those abuses which were deplored by good Catholics themselves. "Would to God," wrote Aleander in the middle of December, 1520, "that we might make an end at last of these many innovations, such as reservations, dispensa-

\* Statuta Concilii Florentini, 1517, ad Iulii de Medicis Card. convocationem celebr. Digesta per Pet. Andr. Gammarum de Casali. Florentiae, haer. Phil. Iuntae, 1518. Besides these rare first-hand official accounts there exists a second, prepared by Pet. Corsus, archiepisc. Florent. vicarius, Florentiae, 1564, in the preface to which Corsus refers to the Council of Trent; and then there is a copy in Mansi which HERGENRÖTHER, VIII., 746-751, makes use of.

† Cf. HEFELE-HERGENRÖTHER, VIII., 751, 753, 759; also pp. 755 and 756 for some reform measures of Wolsey.

‡ To such belonged the sumptuary laws on dress; cf. Appendix, No. 6, the \*Letter of A. Gabbioneta of January 14, 1517 (Gonzaga Archives), Rev. d. Biblioth., VIII., 214, and the decree of March 16, 1517: \*Decretum pontificis super cappello viridi ab omnibus episcopis regularibus portando, sed zambelotto nequaquam ab eisdem inducendo et capuccino luteo (Paris de Grassis, \*Diarium in Secret Archives of the Vatican). For the reform of the Corpus Domini procession, see \*Paris de Grassis ad a. 1516, and HOFFMANN, 462 *seq.*; for the abolition of the ceremony of sending off a dove on Whitsunday in St. Peter's, see HOFFMANN, 461. Of more importance was the appointment of two examiners of candidates for Holy Orders; see AMATI, 232, and Regest. Leonis X., n. 6031.



tions, derogations from the German Concordat, the compositions, and suchlike ; the insatiable pluralists also, who would seize the German benefices too, if they could have hold of the reins ; for the German people associate all these things with Luther's business, and in this way we suffer grievous injury to the Catholic faith, which is our chief concern." \*

\* KALKOFF, Aleander, 48 ; *cf.* 97.

## CHAPTER X.

### THE FRENCH CONCORDAT.—ECCLESIASTICAL POLICY.— CHARACTER AND PONTIFICATE OF LEO X.

THE Council of the Lateran aroused vehement opposition in France at the moment when the Concordat with Francis I. was being ratified within its walls with the utmost pomp and solemnity. When the eleventh session set the seal to this agreement, it was already an accomplished fact, thanks to the negotiations carried on so assiduously after the battle of Marignano. Profiting by the deep impression made by his victory, the astute French monarch knew how to conduct his affairs with consummate ability. It was during the private conference which took place at Bologna on the 11th of December, 1515, at the close of the Consistory, that Francis quite unexpectedly asked his host to confirm the Pragmatic Sanction. Leo X. replied that he could never be induced to tolerate a schismatic constitution, but that he would not be averse to a concordat, having a similar purport to that of the Pragmatic Sanction ; that is to say, all the stipulations in the latter inimical to the Papacy were to be eliminated, and the privileges contained therein to be placed on a legitimate basis. In this and subsequent conversations the Pope and King came to an agreement on essentials. The results must have been even more agreeable to the crafty King than to his former antagonist. By a bold move Francis had secured that for which he had long striven: the substitution for the Prag-

matic Sanction, which he disliked, of a concordat in the highest degree advantageous to himself; and any odium which might arise in his own country, he could avert from himself by referring to the wishes of the Pope, from whom the plan had emanated.\*

After the Pope and the King had come to terms on the main article of the Concordat, the nomination of bishops, confidential persons were entrusted by both with the task of drawing up a convention in proper form. For this purpose the Cardinals Lorenzo Pucci and Pietro Accolti remained behind in Bologna, while Francis was represented by his Chancellor, Du Prat. The negotiations proceeded with difficulty, as each party was a match for the other in diplomatic craft. Notwithstanding their arduous endeavours, the Papal advisers were unable to carry through their demands concerning jurisdiction. After making some concessions they succeeded, in the course of a few weeks, in settling the articles of the compact; by the beginning of February, 1516, the plenipotentiaries had already left Bologna.† At the head of the arrangements stood the Concordat, which, from the French point of view, was looked upon, not unreasonably, as the greatest and most remarkable concession that had ever proceeded from the chair of St. Peter. Thereby, in return for the abrogation of the Pragmatic Sanction, the Pope handed over to the

\* Cf. MADELIN, *De Conventu Bonon.*, 65 *seq.*; cf. 81 *seq.* A second work of Madelin's, in the Parisian journal *Minerva*, 1903, was not within my reach. It appears from the author's admission not to have contained anything really new. Pierre Bourdon of Corbeil (S. et O.) is preparing a special work on the Concordat of 1516; he has published in the *Mél. d'Archéol.*, XXVI., 143 *seq.*, an essay: *Le Concordat de François I<sup>er</sup> et l'indult de Charles-Quint. Leur conflit en Artois, 1518-1521.* Rebouf's tractate on the Concordat appeared first in Paris, 1538; see *Archiv für Kirchenrecht*, LXXXVI., 259.

† Cf. MADELIN, 81 *seq.*, 83 *seq.* See also HANOTAUX, LVI.

French Crown the full right of nomination to the bishoprics and abbeys bestowed in Consistory; all the conditions thereto belonging reappear in the later contract. For nine months in the year the bishops are to appoint to the lower clerical offices; after that the Pope can intervene by mandate. Expectancies and reservations are abolished entirely in France and Dauphiné. All lawsuits affecting the clergy and their benefices, except the *causæ majores* reserved for hearing in Rome, must, under pain of excommunication and deprivation, be settled within two years in the country to which they belong.

Then follows a series of stipulations, which were not adopted in the subsequent Concordat, but for a long time played an important part in the relations between Paris and Rome. The King during his lifetime retained the same rights of patronage in Brittany and Provence as in France; all privileges established in these provinces the Pope promised to uphold. Further, the King was granted the privilege, for one occasion only, of the *primariæ preces*. Leo was also ready to accommodate him in the settlement of the bishoprics of the Duchy of Milan, provided he did not interfere with the lower offices. The Pope was equally willing to make concessions over the Bull of the Crusade; the King was left free to fix the amount of the tithe for the building of St. Peter's. The Pope sent a Legate to France to assess, along with prelates appointed by the King, all taxes on cathedrals and abbeys granted in Consistory; hitherto the customary taxes had been levied. The regulations for indulgences granted to the Knights of the Holy Cross and to the Hospital of Paris, the removal of Wolsey from the administration of the diocese of Tournai, the suppression of two sees created in Savoy, the measures directed against the contumacious clergy in the Arch-



bishopric of Milan, the absolution of all who were under ban for their hostility to the Roman Church, were all points on which, almost without exception, a decision was made favourable to the Most Christian King.\*

Thus with heavy sacrifices Leo purchased peace with France and preserved this important member of Christendom within the unity of the Church. The tenacious Du Prat never swerved from the attainment of that which would gratify the insatiable demands of his master. It was easy to foresee that the conditions exchanged between Paris and Rome would encounter much opposition.

It was apparently in his own court that Francis found the antagonism most speedily quelled. Louisa of Savoy, to whom Francis sent drafts of the terms, that their utility to the throne, the kingdom, and the Church might be considered, expressed herself in their favour. The same opinion was held by distinguished jurists. From different quarters came the advice that "certain points which the Pope had had inserted should be struck out, while others called for more time for reflection." Disregarding these opinions, Francis ordered the Concordat to be read in Parliament and set forth the motives which had led him to conclude this agreement. The Parliament making no reply, he "took their silence for consent." This occurred in the early days of 1516.†

Much more difficult was it to persuade the Cardinals in Consistory. They opposed before all else the numerous concessions on points of ecclesiastical jurisdiction; they demanded with vehemence that the interference of the secular authorities with the incomes and property of the churches should be forbidden. Some were of opinion that it would have been better for the honour of the Pope and

\* Cf. MADELIN, 98 *seq.*; HEFELE-HERGENRÖTHER, VIII., 659 *seq.*

† MADELIN, 85-86.

the Holy See if no bargain had been struck and things had remained as they were. The Sacred College, in fact, endeavoured to reject the articles which were much too favourable to the State. To clear the way for an adjustment, the King, in April, 1516, ordered a confidential friend of Du Prat, Roger de Barme by name, to go to Rome. A full half year was now spent in negotiations; they were rendered difficult because Francis proposed alterations in the Bolognese arrangements\* and demanded yet further concessions. The King's plenipotentiary, whose qualities were highly praised by Leo himself, made the journey between Paris and Rome at least four times. There were great differences of opinion over the result; both parties spoke of an alteration in the original conditions; according to the French, this was favourable to the Pope; according to Cardinal Medici, it was to his disadvantage.† Be this as it may, it was in any case a successful achievement that, during this third and final stage of its development, the Papal diplomacy succeeded in coupling the acceptance of the Concordat with the condemnation of the Pragmatic Sanction.‡

The first and most important stipulation of the Concordat of the 18th August, 1516,§ which applied to the

\* Cf. Manosc. Torrig., XXIV., 30.

† Cf. MADELIN, 86-87. The important \**Informatio episcopo Tricariensi S. D. N. nuntio* (State Archives, Florence), which requires publication and is assigned by GUASTI (Manosc. Torrig., XXVI., 179) to 1514, belongs to 1516.

‡ See HANOTAUX, LX.

§ The French Concordat has been often printed, as by HARDOUIN, IX., 1867 *seq.*; MÜNCH, I., 226 *seq.*; NUSSI, 20 *seq.* Thorough summaries in HEFELE-HERGENRÖTHER, VIII., 663 *seq.*, and ROHRBACHER-KNOPFLER, 464 *seq.* For the different arrangement and division of the separate articles, see BAUER, 234. I have found, in the Secret Archives of the Vatican, the original copy of the French

kingdom of France, Dauphiné, and the Marquisates of Die and Valentinois, concerned the appointment to bishoprics. The Concordat conveyed to the French King, for the time being, along with the repeal of the Pragmatic Sanction and of the right of election of the cathedral chapter, the right of nomination to all vacant bishoprics. It was demanded that, within six months from the day of vacancy, the candidate to be nominated to the Pope should take his degree as master or licentiate of theology or canon law, that he should have attained at least his twenty-seventh year, and be also in other respects a fitting person. If the King's nominee possessed the requisite qualifications the Pope confirmed his appointment; if not, the King had the right to nominate another fit person within three months. In default of this, or if the vacancy occurred through the death in Rome of the holder of the see, the Pope had full power of appointment.\* The King also had the power of appointing blood relations and persons of high rank, as well as learned members of the reformed orders who were unable to acquire academical degrees. The same right of nomination was given the King for abbéys and priories, only in this case the candidate must belong to the order in question and be at least three-and-twenty years old. The chapters of churches, monasteries,

Concordat belonging to Leo X. It is written on parchment, and is in shape like a small folio volume, bound in white silk. In front are the arms of Leo and Francis beautifully illuminated and richly gilded. The lead seal hangs from a red and yellow silk ribbon. In the marginal notes I believe the handwriting of Leo to be clearly recognizable. They form a sort of analysis of contents. The only one of interest is on f. 12, on the article "*de vero valore exprimendo*." This runs: \**De expressione veri valoris, de quo nil fieri dicitur in Gallia.*

\* The validity of this reservation was contested in France; see HINSCHIUS, III., 164, n. 7.

and priories, whose right of free election was reserved by special Papal privilege, were excepted.

The Concordat made a clean sweep of all expectancies and reservations, while the provisions for benefices by any other patron than the King were kept within strict bounds. Every Pope had the right, but only once in the course of his Pontificate, to bestow expectancies, and this in such a way that for every ten benefices in his patronage he was entitled to one such presentation, and for every fifty or more, to two such.

All legal processes, with the exception of the *causæ majores*, were to be settled by the existing judges of the country in which the suits arose. To avoid frivolous appeals, the ruling of the Court was to hold good without immediate appeal to the Holy See; appeals even from those holding directly from Rome were to be laid before judges in France pending the delivery of judgment, except in cases of miscarriage of justice or of legitimate fear.

Special stipulations were directed against the groundless disturbance of the holders of benefices, against open concubinage, as well as the frivolous imposition of the Church punishments of excommunication, suspension, and interdict. Resignations of benefices were only to be held valid on the production of authentic documentary evidence. Finally, it was agreed that if the Concordat were not ratified and accepted by the French Parliament and people within six months, it would not be valid.

Hardly less important than the articles of the Concordat are its omissions. Although many of the stipulations of the Pragmatic Sanction passed into the new convention, yet the proposition that the Pope is subordinate to a General Council is absent. Silence on this point made it possible for the former view of this relationship to be again revived. The abolition of annates also was



not mentioned in the Concordat; their reintroduction was thereby made possible.\*

After the ratification of the Concordat by the Pope on the 18th of August, 1516, its administration was at once proceeded with, regardless of the fact that the French Parliament had not entered it on the registers. This may be taken as certain, although a greater part of the Acts referring to it have been lost. From the documents that remain it is clear with what inconsiderateness and almost cynical naïveté Francis at once proceeded to extract every possible advantage from the treaty.† The King's favour and purely secular considerations prevailed in the choice of candidates for church preferment. Even in cases where the abbeys still had the free choice of election, the latter took place in the presence of a royal official, who brought such pressure to bear that freedom of voting was out of the question. It was just as bad when the examination of candidates at Rome was speedily degraded into a mere matter of form.‡ The domineering influence of the French King, which had so long swayed the Church, was now turned into a permanent system, firmly established by law.§ Already on the 16th of September, 1516, the Concordat as a whole was extended to Brittany and Provence.||

Since the Concordat settled that in case of the nullity

\* SCHMIDT, II., 591; HANOTAUX, LIX.; BAUDRILLART, 80. RANKE (Französ. Gesch., I., 104) is wrong in stating that the Concordat restored the annates to the Pope.

† Cf. MADELIN, *Les premières applications du concordat de 1516, d'après les dossiers du château Saint-Ange*, in *Mél. d'Archéol.*, XVII., 323 *seq.*, and MAGAUD, *Un procès canonique au 16<sup>me</sup> siècle*, in *Annal. de Saint-Louis-des-Français*, VI., 249 *seq.*

‡ MADELIN, *Applications*, 335, 359-360.

§ Cf. IMBART DE LA TOUR, I., 109.

|| Manosc. Torrig., XXVI., 177.

of a presentation being pronounced, a correct account of the income of the benefice should be rendered, Leo had for long hoped that in addition to this he might carry out the restoration of annates, but in vain. On this point Francis showed not the least sign of yielding,\* and Leo had to submit.

The King showed equal firmness in presence of the heated opposition to the Concordat which he encountered from the clergy, Parliament, and the Universities. In order to break this opposition and give to the whole agreement the utmost possible solemnity, Leo X. embodied in a Bull, which he laid before the Council for acceptance at the eleventh session on the 19th of December, 1516, the Concordat which he had already published on the 18th of August.† To the astonishment of the Pope and the members of the Council, the French envoys did not attend this session; they gave their adhesion "in private," says Paris de Grassis.‡ The envoys kept away on a hint from Paris, where the storm in Parliament was foreseen, since in the same session of the Council, after long preparation,§ the express and solemn repeal of the Pragmatic Sanction was to be announced. The constitution|| relating to the French Concordat was read by the Bishop of Isernia. The Pope herein insisted on the full validity of the Concordat derived from the conjoint assent of himself and the Cardinals; his object in submitting it to the

\* MADELIN, *De conventu Bononiae*, 111 *seqq.*, and *Mélanges d'Archéol.*, XVII., 350. Cf. HEFELE-HERGENRÖTHER, VIII., 674; GÉRARDIN, *Bénéf. Eccl.*, 85 *seq.*

† Bull, *Primitiva Ecclesia*, dat. XV. Cal., Sept. 1516; HARDOUIN, IX., 1810-1825; Bull. V., 664 *seq.*

‡ See MADELIN, *De conventu Bonon.*, 87-88.

§ See SANUTO, XXII., 471, 524, 605; XXIII., 173.

|| *Divina disponente clementia* of December 19, 1516; HARDOUIN, IX., 1809 to 1829, and Bull. V., 678 *seq.*

approval of the Council was thus to give its position greater security. The Pope also laid stress on the duty incumbent on him of maintaining the unity of the Church; he then sketched the previous history of the Concordat from the reign of Pius II. onwards. The advantages of the measure were appraised with profuse rhetoric, and the corresponding disadvantages of the wholesale surrender of the rights of nomination were as much as possible kept out of sight. The establishment of peace and of the common law in France implied such a great gain for Church and State, that no sacrifice was too great to make for it. The harsh description of the abuses accompanying the election of bishops and abbots was meant to serve as an explanation of the relentless way in which these appointments had been handed over.

Such an insincere conclusion was not likely to convince the more intelligent of the fathers. Only a few, however, gave expression to their alarm in the Council. Domenico Jacobazzi, Bishop of Nocera dei Pagani, supported by two others, grounded his assent on the very doubtful condition that the withdrawal of the Pragmatic Sanction was accepted by the French people. Like him too, without doubt, Girolamo Ghinucci of Ascoli, who asked that the agreement might have the formal acceptance of both parties, saw through the manœuvres of the French statesmen. The Bishop of Chios disapproved of the royal assent being required for resignations in Curia, and the Bishop of Tortona of the arrangements with regard to the attacks of Parliament on the legal immunities of the clergy. All the other leading churchmen give their assent unconditionally.\*

A French Bishop then mounted the pulpit and read out

\* HEFELE-HERGENRÖTHER, VIII., 710.

the decree *Pastor Æternus*,\* which removed the “pestilence of Bourges.” It insisted, in the first place, on the primacy of the Church in matters of faith. It then went on to relate, in considerable detail, how Julius II. had invited to the Council the supporters of the Pragmatic Sanction, although he might without further consideration have cut off this “French gangrene” which threatened the souls of men and fostered schism; how Leo also, with the concurrence of the Council, had extended the time of grace from date to date, without any of these recalcitrants presenting themselves. From this was shown the character of the “depravity” by which the Pragmatic Sanction of Louis XI. had been revived by these men; they aimed at lessening the Papal power, and contested the absolute right of the Pope to bestow benefices on deserving Cardinals and members of the Curia; they encouraged prelates to be disobedient, thus destroying the “very nerve of ecclesiastical discipline”; they were not regularly in possession of their sees, but at the utmost were only tolerated by the Pope; finally, that the assembly of Basle was a mere conventicle (*conciliabulum*). A great array of instances from ancient church history were produced to show that the Pope, who was above all Councils, alone had the right to summon, prorogue, and dissolve them. On these grounds Leo, in the present Council, could not avoid annulling such an evil system without placing on himself and the Cardinals a stigma of disgrace. Since Scripture and tradition teach the necessity of obedience to the Bishop of Rome on the part of all the faithful, the constitution of Boniface VIII., *Unam Sanctam*, will be solemnly renewed, and the explanatory Bull, *Meruit*, be maintained. The Pragmatic Sanction is given up and removed from

\* LABBÉ, XIV., 309 *seq.*; Bull. V., 659 *seq.* Cf. also GRAUERT in *Histor. Jahrbuch.*, IX., 144 *seq.*



the archives of the kingdom under penalty of the Pope's reserved ban, along with disqualification for all ecclesiastical office in the case of a priest, and denial of all clerical ministrations in the case of a layman.

All the fathers said simply "Placet." The Bishop of Tortona added: "I am pleased at the repeal of the outcome of the Councils, or rather, the conventicles of Basle and Bourges."\* When Pope Leo's turn came, so relates his Master of the Ceremonies, he cried in a loud and triumphant voice: "Non solum placet, sed multum placet et perplacet." "I not only assent, but I assent gladly and entirely."†

From more than one point of view this rejoicing of the Pope at his triumph over the schismatic tendencies of Bourges was justified. A hard and protracted struggle of eighty years had thus ended in victory for the Holy See; for the moment Leo X. forgot entirely the price at which the great victory had been bought. Cardinal Medici at once informed the Papal plenipotentiaries at Paris that the Council had confirmed the Concordat with the unanimous consent of all the Cardinals and eighty Bishops; in spite of the peculiar attitude of the French envoys, it was hoped that Francis would keep his word, and that effect would be given to the decrees of the Pope and Council.‡ In April, 1517, the Acts of the Council were at length officially handed to the King; the Nuncio presented the Bull for the repeal of the Pragmatic Sanction in a violet cover, that for the Concordat § in a white one. The choice of colours

\* HEFELE-HERGENRÖTHER, VIII., 714.

† Paris de Grassis in MADELIN, 89.

‡ Monoscr. Torrig., XX., 249 *seq.*

§ Manoscr. Torrig., XX., 386. The original deed of the Concordat is preserved in the National Archives in Paris; it has the signature of the Pope and the Cardinals, the lead seal is attached to a red and

evidently seems symbolical. Before the Acts reached France the storm against the treaty between King and Pope had broken loose.

As soon as the Concordat became known, the clergy, the Parliament and the University of Paris were in a state of agitation. All those who had hoped that the victorious King would compel Leo to accept the Pragmatic Sanction found themselves bitterly deceived. The Concordat was opposed not merely to the views of the partisans of the conciliar ideas, but by the removal of free election it damaged the interests of a great number. "Defence of Gallican liberties" became the watchword. Since, under penalty of the nullity of the whole treaty, Francis was pledged within six months to have the same proclaimed to clergy and people, to have it accepted, published, sworn to and registered, he had to strain every nerve to master the opposition. But so vehement was the latter that he had twice to beg for a respite of a year.\*

In vain had the Chancellor Du Prat, in one of his speeches addressed in February, 1517, to the Prelates, Councillors of Parliament and Professors of the University, exposed the political reasons which had influenced the King to conclude the Concordat.† In vain had Francis explained that, since the Pragmatic Sanction was bound to go, he

yellow silk ribbon. The original Bull of Leo (December 19, 1516) for the repeal of the Pragmatic Sanction is also preserved there; it is a parchment volume bound in silk and magnificently adorned with the arms of Leo and Francis. The seal is the same as above. Leo's signature runs: Ego Leo X<sup>mus</sup> catholice ecclē eḡs subscripsi. Facsimile in GUIFFREY, Musée des Arch. Nat., Paris, 1893, 121.

\* These delays were granted on July 1, 1517, and June 26, 1518, by the \*Bulls *Dudum Siquidem*. dat. Romae, 1517, Cal. Julii, and *Dudum Siquidem*, dat. Romae, 1518, Sexto. Cal. Julii. Originals in National Archives, Paris. The first Bull is printed in MÜNCH, I., 252 *seq.*

† Cf. MÜNCH, I., 255.

had to consider how, by means of the Concordat, he could prevent the recurrence of the disorders which had prevailed previous to the Sanction. The royal letters-patent of May, 1517,\* enjoining on the Parliaments of Paris, Bordeaux, Toulouse, Grenoble, and on the King's judges the observance of the Concordat, met with the most obstinate resistance. The Parliament of Paris stoutly refused to register and publish the measure; they declared that the new treaty would bring ruin on the State, destroy the liberties of the Gallican Church, and deprive them of their means of help. Although Francis I. brought all his influence to bear, the Parliament would not yield. They had not the power, nor was it their duty to publish and register the Concordat; much rather should the Pragmatic Sanction be upheld with greater care than ever, and time be given to the University of Paris and others to express their opinions.†

In a detailed remonstrance, the Parliament showed further that the Concordat, along with several good enactments, contained many that were bad and dangerous; but the repeal of the Pragmatic Sanction was an injury to France, an outrage on the Synods of Basle and Constance; an appeal must be made to a fresh Council.‡ All the eloquence of Du Prat was without result; even the concession demanded of the Pope that, in inferior benefices, the income should be computed at twenty-four ducats,§ caused no alteration in the view of the Parliamentary party.

\* The original draft of these patents, dat. Paris, 1517, May 13, is in the National Archives, Paris. Place and date have here been inserted later; the ink shows this. This explains how elsewhere (MÜNCH, I., 251) May 12 is given.

† MÜNCH, I., 258 *seq.*; HEFELE-HERGENRÖTHER, VIII., 737 *seq.*

‡ MÜNCH, I., 268 *seq.*

§ HEFELE-HERGENRÖTHER, VIII., 741.

They insisted that the Concordat was contrary to the honour of God, the liberties of the Church, and the well-being of the realm.\* Not less persistent was the opposition of the Theological Faculty of the University of Paris, which was held in high reputation throughout the whole of France.†

The agitation was carried on recklessly: envenomed pasquinades against Leo X. and Du Prat were circulated.‡ On the last day of February, 1518, Francis declared that he was weary of the negotiations; he could not suffer the Parliament, like a Venetian Senate, to overthrow engagements which he had concluded, and forthwith gave orders for the publication of the Concordat. On the 15th and 19th of March, La Tremouille, in the King's name, repeated the order with threatening words. Then, at last, the Parliament, in order to avoid worse troubles, gave in and undertook, under protest, to proceed to publish and register the Concordat; at the same time they appealed to the Pope better informed and to the next General Council regularly assembled.§ The publication and entry in the registers took place on the 22nd of March.|| Five days later the University of Paris protested and appealed, at the same time, to a future Council. The King thereupon ordered the arrest of some of the most violent of the Professors, and forbade the University to meddle with affairs of state. On the 12th of April, Francis issued from Amboise the general instructions for registration, which were

\* *Seconde Remontrance de la cour du parlement* in MÜNCH, I., 393-307.

† *Cf.* FÉRET, *La faculté de théologie de Paris, Époque mod.* I., Paris, 1900, who discusses this opposition in the last book.

‡ ROSCOE-HENKE, II., 281; FIERVILLE, Jouffroy, 148.

§ MÜNCH, I., 261 *seq.*, 265 *seq.*

|| *Cf.* BAUER, 238.



then taken up by the Parliaments of Toulouse, Bordeaux, and Grenoble.\* On the 14th of April a second edict of Francis I. announced the repeal of the Pragmatic Sanction.†

In proportion to the satisfaction caused at Rome by the firm attitude of the King ‡ was the indifference shown towards the opposition of the University of Paris, an opposition which many in Germany regarded much more seriously.§ As the result of mature consideration, there appeared on the 16th of June, 1518, a Bull, couched in severe terms, against the appeal of the University of Paris.|| This was followed on the 25th of June by an edict of

\* HEFELE-HERGENRÖTHER, VIII., 743; BAUER, 239. Cf. Rev. d'hist. dipl., XIV., 220. After the \*registration notices in the above-mentioned royal letters-patent of May 13, 1517, came the registration at Toulouse on May 10 (therefore not as late as November 22, as is most often stated), that at Bordeaux on May 31, and at Grenoble on September 3, 1518. National Archives, Paris.

† \*Original, dated Amboise, April 14, 1518, in the National Archives, Paris, J., 942.

‡ Cf. Manosc. Torrig., XXIII., 8. The satisfaction of the Curia also explains the *Indulto Leonino* granted in 1518 to Francis for Lombardy; see GALANTE, Placitaz., 68.

§ The protest of the Paris University, 1518, as everyone knows, gave Luther a model for his appeal to a Council. Cf. Vol. VII. of this work, p. 378.

|| The \*original of this long Bull, with the leaden seal attached, is in the National Archives, Paris, J. 942. Also the original of the \*Bull on the Concordat to the Cardinal-Legate de Boissy, dated May 16, 1518; the \**Facultas* given to Francis I., indicating the first month from which the execution of the Concordat in the provinces was to begin, dated June 15, 1518; the *Secunda prorogatio publicationis concordati*, dat. June 26, 1518; also a volume: \**Causes et raisons qui ont déterminé le Roi à faire avec le Pape le concordat* (a contemporaneous minute, interesting for the views of Francis I.). Cf. also \**Enquête de 1518 contre les opposants au concordat* (folio volume of about 150 quarto pages). National Archives, Paris, J. 1027.

Leo X. which authorized the Cardinal-Legate Bibbiena to pronounce against the Rector and University of Paris the censures and punishments to which they were liable for their open rebellion against the two highest authorities, whereby they incurred the guilt of schism and heresy, and, while esteeming themselves wise, had become fools. This document set forth the highest claims of the Papal power, whereby the decrees of former Pontiffs as well as of Councils might be altered or abrogated; the rashness of the appellants was sharply reproved, the repeal of the Pragmatic Sanction justified, the complaints against the Roman See briefly refuted, the appeal characterized as a false and ludicrous libel, which was null and ineffectual, and full powers were given to the Legates to proceed against the guilty parties and their followers.\*

The opposition to the Concordat, and especially to the repeal of the Pragmatic Sanction, survived in France, even after external resistance had disappeared, down to the fall of the ancient monarchy,† and no wonder; for nowhere had schismatical tendencies struck such deep roots as there. Had there been no Concordat, the separation of the French Church from Rome would have become, without doubt, an accomplished fact. Through the great advantages which the new treaty legally guaranteed to the Crown, the schismatic movements lost the unconditional support of the monarchy, but they gained that of the independent provincial parliaments; the latter carried on with energy the opposition once waged against Rome through the

\* Leo X. to Bibbiena, Rome, 1518, June 25, first published by HERGENRÖTHER, VIII., 855 *seq.* Cf. Manosc. Torrig., XXIII., 12.

† Cf. (DAUNON), *Essai hist. sur la puissance temp. des Papes*, I., 4th ed., Paris, 1818, 300 *seq.*; PICOT, *Hist. des États généraux*, I., Paris, 1872, 430, n. 1.; BAUDRILLART, 90, 97 *seq.*

protection of alleged judicial prerogatives and national interests.\*

It is exceedingly difficult, in dealing with treaties which, like the Concordat, mean a compromise, to estimate correctly the loss and gain which is bound to accrue to both the contracting parties.† Thus up to the present time very varying judgments have been passed on the Concordat.

The advantage which fell to the Papacy consisted mainly in the victorious ending to the long and unfruitful struggle against the Pragmatic Sanction. What Pius II., Sixtus IV., and even Julius II. had attempted in vain, the clever Medici Pope achieved: the last remnant of the conciliar opposition vanished,‡ the supreme authority of the Papacy was again recognized in France, and this country, which had taken up a schismatic position, was linked anew to the Holy See.§ This momentous result was certainly bought at such a costly price that perhaps it may be spoken of as a Pyrrhic victory.

By the right of nomination the Crown had, with very scanty limitations, the privilege of appointing *personæ gratæ* to all the high offices of the French Church, ten archbishoprics, eighty-three bishoprics, and five hundred and twenty-seven abbeys. In order to appreciate the meaning

\* PHILLIPS, III., 341. Cf. 351 *seq.* for the (especially about 1533) repeated application of the "appellatio ab abusu" by Francis I. See also PICOT, *loc. cit.*, IV., 228.

† Cf. D. B. [Deboulav], *Hist. du droit public ecclés. franç.*, Lond., 1637, 232 *seqq.*

‡ Cf. MAURENBRECHER, *Kathol. Reformation*, I., 108 *seq.*; MARCKS, *Coligny* (1892), 258; MADELIN, III.

§ Cf. HANOTAUX, LIX.; DE MEAUX, *Luttes religieuses*, 44; MAULDE, *Origines*, 136; and BAUDRILLART, 81, 86. Certainly the root of the schismatic tendency remained. Acquaviva's memorial of 1568, in LAEMMER, *Melet.*, 222 dwells on this.

of this we must realize, in the first place, the extraordinary wealth of the French Church. According to some accounts the French clergy were then owners of a third, according to others of even two-thirds of the whole soil.\* These accounts are certainly exaggerated. On the other hand, it is certain that in 1516 the total income of the French clergy amounted to five million livres—almost as much as that of the state.† The whole of these extraordinarily large revenues were now at the disposal of the Crown; never before had the monarchy obtained such an increment of power at a single blow.‡ How perilous in and for itself such a dependence of the whole higher clergy on the ruling power might be, how easily the latter might lie open to the temptation of encroaching arbitrarily, not only on the Church's property, but on something much greater, even on the faith itself, is self-evident.§ Some guarantees certainly were offered in the limitations to which the King was subject and in the right of control which Rome had secured. But these were not sufficient to prevent the Concordat being very soon abused as an engine of oppression and far-reaching injury to the Church.

With inconceivable carelessness Rome neglected to effect any change in the control which she was capable of exercising: no attempts were made in this direction before Pius V.|| The Crown, however, with a selfish cynicism, exploited to the uttermost the treaty which was such a source of advantage. The Concordat, in itself, was less injurious to the Church of France than the circumstance

\* MARCKS, Coligny, 259.

† Cf. IMBART DE LA TOUR, I., 361.

‡ HANOTAUX, LVIII. ; DE MEAUX, 44.

§ Cf. IMBART DE LA TOUR, I., 112.

|| Cf. MADELIN in *Mél. d'Archéol.*, XVII., 360; DE MEAUX, 46; BAUDRILLART, 106.



that Francis, heedless of the earnest expostulations of the noble Lodovico di Canossa,\* abused without scruple, in the most shameful way, the extraordinary privileges accorded to him, and often raised the most unworthy nominees to the highest offices in the Church.† “Like a good-natured, open-handed boon companion,” says a Venetian Envoy, “he gives away bishoprics in answer to ladies’ entreaties and abbeys to soldiers in lieu of pay; in short, he makes himself popular with all sorts of men, without giving a thought to their personal characters.”‡ What grave evils sprang from this state of things will be described only too often in the course of this history.

Nevertheless the Concordat had this good result; it set up a powerful barrier against the separatist tendency which threatened to detach France from Rome, a barrier which stood firm throughout the storms let loose by the Reformation.§ The clergy were certainly brought into the closest dependence on the Crown, but yet were not separated from Rome; since the Crown controlled church property indirectly, the temptation, at least, to downright spoliation was removed. The Concordat, undoubtedly,

\* Cf. his *Trattato del governo del regno di Francia*, addressed to Francis I., to which I return again, in Cod. Urb., 858, Vatican Library.

† FÈVRE points this out correctly, *Papauté*, V., 202. Cf. BAUDRILLART, 106 *seqq.*

‡ RAUMER, *Briefe aus Paris*, I., 231. Cf. RANKE, *Französ. Gesch.*, I., 123; WOHLTHAT, *Ueber das Verhältniß von Staat und Kirche in Frankreich im 16 und 17 Jahrhundert*, Burg, 1574, 8 *seq.*; MAULDE, *Origines de la Réolut. franc.*, Paris, 1889; and DE MEAUX, 348. How correct the remark here made is, that the right of nomination was specially harmful to the abbeys, cf. *Studien und Mittheilungen aus dem Benediktinerorden*, 1891, 54 *seq.*; see also GÉRARDIN, *Bénéf. eccl.*, 92 *seq.*

§ Cf. HANOTAUX, *Étud. hist. sur le 16<sup>e</sup> et 17<sup>e</sup> siècles en France*, Paris, 1886. See also BAUDRILLART, 80.

made the King, to a certain extent, the overlord of the French Church, but also at the same time its natural protector. The Kings had now most powerful motives for remaining Catholic.\* In order to understand the extraordinary situation of Leo X., we must always bear in mind that the French Crown, long before the Concordat was entered into, had, as a matter of fact, disposed, with almost unlimited power, of the high dignities of the Church.† Therefore the treaty meant nothing else than the legal recognition of a long existing state of things; it was the end of a long development.‡ As things were, the Concordat was, perhaps, the only way in which the then existing privileges could have been placed on a legal basis, and the great evil, the complete separation of France from Rome, have been prevented.§ It would, however, be a grave deception to suppose that, this result having been secured, the French Church was no longer a cause of anxiety; the crisis was only deferred, it had not been rendered impossible.

Leo X.'s concessions were not confined to France. With other States also he made arrangements of such a far-reaching kind that half a century later they were the subject of comment in the Roman Court.||

In Spain the monarchy had received from Sixtus IV. and Innocent VIII. privileges of presentation and patron-

\* Besides MADELIN, 112 *seq.*, *cf.* especially HANOTAUX, LXII. See also LEA, II., 134.

† *Cf.* IMBART DE LA TOUR, I., 109.

‡ *Ibid*, 122 *seq.* *Cf.* also MAULDE, Origines, 277.

§ That Leo chose the lesser evil is urged in the memorial of Aquaviva, see LAEMMER, Melet., 222. Without knowing this passage, HANOTAUX, LV., speaks to the same effect. See also STAUDENMAIER, Bischofswahlen, 346.

|| *Cf.* \*letter of Capilupi, dat. Rom., 1573, June 6. Gonzaga Archives, Mantua.

age of such a comprehensive character that hardly anything was left that the temporal power could desire.\* By the law also of 1476 the Crown, through the Royal Council, exercised the widest supervision over the spiritual jurisdiction. The Kings claimed too the right of refusal of Papal enactments, the so-called right of the *retención de bulas*.† In addition there was the Cruzada or Bull of the Crusade, conferring certain spiritual graces, which was transferred to the Crown, as a means of defraying the expenses of the war against the infidels. Like his predecessor, Leo had also, in 1519, sanctioned such a Cruzada under conditions of the widest scope.‡ The legal claim to refuse Papal Bulls was met on the 1st of March, 1519,§ by a constitution of Leo's which had quite as little success as his attempt to subject the Spanish Inquisition to the procedure of the common law, since the Pope just at that moment stood in need of Charles as a political ally.||

Leo stood in remarkable relations with the ruler of Portugal, whose activity "in defending and spreading the faith in Africa, Æthiopia, and Arabia" he could not sufficiently praise. For this purpose the King received important privileges, the tenth of the property of the clergy and a portion of the *Cruciata*. We have already spoken of the privileges granted by Leo to Emmanuel the Great for his possessions over-sea.¶ Very valuable was the right of patronage over the three religious orders of Knighthood of St. James, St. Avitus, and Christ, conceded to the King

\* Cf. Vol. IV. of this work, p. 397, and Vol. V., p. 338.

† Cf. PHILIPPSON in the *Histor. Zeitschr.*, XXXIX., 272 *seq.*

‡ Cf. GUICCIARDINI, *Opere inedite*, VI., 296 *seq.*; HERGENRÖTHER in *Archiv für Kirchenrecht*, X., 20.

§ Bull. V., 714 *seq.*

|| LLORENTE, I., 468 *seq.* Cf. *supra*, pp. 19, 24.

¶ Cf. Vol. VII. of this work, p. 77.

on the 30th of June, 1516.\* The prodigal liberality of the Pope, however, was always met by fresh demands and proposals on the part of the King. The former was far too compliant. In 1515, in contravention of the regulations of the Lateran Council, he promised to bestow on the King's fourth son, Alfonso, who was still a boy, the first vacant bishopric in Portugal. In 1516 the Portuguese Envoy went the length of requesting further that Alfonso should be admitted to the Cardinalate, and in the same year he was made Bishop of Guarda. In July, 1517, at the great nomination of Cardinals, Alfonso was included; the only condition imposed was that he should not assume the insignia of his rank until he was eighteen. With all this the King was not satisfied: Alfonso had hardly been made Cardinal before he pressed for yet additional ecclesiastical dignities.†

If the case of Portugal was an exception, yet in almost all the other Latin countries the Pope had had to protest and take steps repeatedly against acts of violence towards the clergy and other infringements of ecclesiastical liberties.‡ Among the Italian States the self-centred

\* Corp. dipl. Port., I., 375. Cf. also RANKE, *Päpste*, I., 6th ed., 28.

† Corp. dipl. Port., I., 312 *seq.*, 322 *seq.*, 346 *seq.*, 352 *seq.*, 363 *seq.*, 387, 474, 498, II., 5, 39; MACSWINEY, 139 *seq.*, 146 *seq.* Cf. *supra*, p. 411 n.

‡ On this point KALKOFF (*Forschungen*, 35 *seq.*) has recently borne evidence by producing instances from the *Acta Consist.* To this subject belong also the \*letters of Leo X. to Francis I., dated Viterbo, 1515, November 1, and Florence, 1516, February 7, in the National Archives, Paris. KALKOFF (*Die Beziehungen der Hohenzollern zur Kurie*, in *Quellen und Forschungen*, IX., 88–139) shows how on the one side the Curia, under the pressure of the Lutheran movement, yielded more and more to the numerous requests of the Brandenburg Princes, and how, on the other, the latter raised their demands on account of the precarious condition of the Church in Germany.



Republic of Venice indulged in many acts of aggression;\* the Pope had also to bestir himself against the Marchioness Isabella d'Este† and several towns in the States of the Church, as he had to do against the Swiss,‡ in defence of the Church's freedom. Certainly the corrupt state of the clergy was one of the causes of this one-sided action on the part of the State. Often criminals attempted to escape punishment by an appeal to the privileges of the clergy, against which Leo, in 1520, took suitable measures on behalf of the Venetian Republic.§ The freedom of the clergy from taxation was made the subject of a Concordat with Florence in 1516.||

The Council of the Lateran opened the way for a closer connection between Poland and Rome, the co-operation of that kingdom being announced by Joannes de Laski, Primate and Archbishop of Gnesen.¶ The two decisive factors in this movement were the Turkish danger and the dispute between Poland and the Teutonic Order. In the latter respect the wishes of Poland were in agreement with the secret views of Leo X., who was also averse to this quarrel being brought before the Council.

\* Cf. SANUTO, XXVIII., 436 ; XXX., 352, 361. For a dispute with the Republic about the Inquisition in Brescia, see LEA, Inquisition, I., 539.

† See the \*Brief to the Marchioness Isabella of Este, of May 23, 1520 (Gonzaga Archives, Mantua), and those to the Abbat of St. Pietro and the Prior of S. Severo, of April 3, 1514, in the Capitular Archives, Perugia.

‡ Cf. Manosc. Torrig., XXIII., 11.

§ SANUTO, XXIX., 316 *seq.*

|| Cf. the account in SCADUTO, Stato e Chiesa sotto Leopoldo I., Firenze, 1885, 87, and Histor. Jahrb., IX., 107.

¶ Laski was called Legatus Natus (*cf. infra*, p. 438). While this title was not recognized in Cracow in October, 1515, the honour was restored to him later in Gnesen ; see BRZEZIŃSKI, O stosunku piatego powszechnego soboru Lateraneńskiego do Polski, Kraków, 1897, 65-66.

The presence of Laski in Rome led to many important results both politically and ecclesiastically; he informed the Pope of the critical state of affairs in the Polish kingdom, which was overrun by infidels and schismatics, and negotiated the Bull of the 14th of November, 1513, which limited the Papal reservations and expectancies to certain canonries and archdeaconries,\* as well as the still more important one of the 9th of August, 1515.† This latter regulated the discipline of the Polish Church by an agreement between the Pope and King Sigismund I. These articles contained salutary provisions for the election and residence of Bishops, the reform of pastoral duties, intercourse with schismatics, and the infliction of censures. A Bull of the 25th of July, 1515, bestowed on the Archbishop the title of *legatus natus*.‡ Of the greatest importance for Poland was a Bull of the 1st of July, 1519,§ negotiated by Bishop Erasmus Ciolek of Plock.|| In this the Pope, in accordance with the King's wishes, confirmed all favours granted in the Council as well as the privileges previously granted to individual Polish Bishops; he also declared all Papal reservations and expectancies null if they interfered with the episcopal *alternativa mensium*; the latter was granted to all Polish Bishops for six months instead of

\* Regest. Leonis X., n. 5372. THEINER, Mon. Pol., II., 345 *seqq.* Cf. BRZEZIŃSKI, O Konkordatach Stolicy Apostolskiej, z. Polska, w. XVI., wieku, Kraków, 1893, 12, and note 6, p. 68.

† Regest. Leonis X., n. 16,905, and BRZEZIŃSKI, o Konkordatach Stolicy Apostolskiej, 13.

‡ The original of this Bull, printed in KORYTOWSKI (Arcybiskupi Gnieźnieńscy II., Poznań, 1888, 622) is in the Archives of the Cathedral Chapter of Gnesen, Nr. 625.

§ The Bull *Romanus Pontifex* was first published by BRZEZIŃSKI, o Konkordatach Stolicy Apostolskiej, 22 *seq.*

|| Cf. ST. LUKASA, Erazm Ciolek Biskup Plocki, 1502–1522, Warszawa, 1878.

four, as prescribed by the rules of the Chancery. This Bull was, in fact, a Concordat save in name and outward form; it was withdrawn under Clement VII.\*

From the beginning of his Pontificate Leo X. had had close relationship with Henry VIII. of England. After the death† of the King's representative, Cardinal Christopher Bainbridge, a man who had become thoroughly italianized, and was hated for his arrogance, his post was filled by Silvestro Gigli, Bishop of Worcester.‡ The efforts of this accomplished diplomatist were mainly instrumental in obtaining for the English minister, Thomas Wolsey, the rank of Cardinal. The latter,§ who was destined to play an important and eventful part in the intercourse between Rome and England, was born in 1471 in Ipswich, in the county of Suffolk, the son of a humble citizen. He began his career as King's Almoner, and knew how to make himself indispensable to his master by cleverness and subserviency. Soon the most important affairs passed almost entirely through Wolsey's hands; his influence over Henry VIII. became permanent. Of uncommon ability, but ambitious and covetous, he soon became the recipient of the richest benefices: in 1513 he was Bishop of Tournai, in 1514 that of Lincoln, and in the same year, on the death of Bainbridge, was advanced to the Archbishopric of York. Still dissatisfied, Wolsey now aimed yet further at the

\* By the Bull *Cum Singulare*, December 1, 1525, in BRZEZIŃSKI, 24 *seq.* Cf. BRZEZIŃSKI in the Abhandl. der Krakauer Akademie, XXX., 262 *seq.*, and in Anzeiger der Krakauer Akademie, 1893, 338 *seq.*

† It was affirmed by poison. Gigli was accused quite unjustly. See CREIGHTON, IV., 206 *seq.*; MARTIN, 234 *seq.* Cf. also FERRAJOLI in Arch. d. Soc. Rom., XIX., 440 *seq.* Bainbridge's tomb (inscription in FORCELLA, VII., 171) is in the College of St. Thomas of Canterbury in the Via Monserrato.

‡ For GIGLI, cf. Cornelius de Fine, \*Diary, National Library, Paris.

§ Cf. CREIGHTON, Cardinal Wolsey, London, 1858.



Cardinal's hat. Henry did what he could at Rome; Leo held out against the appointment for a considerable time, but at last yielded under the pressure of political circumstances; on the 10th of September, 1515, Wolsey was nominated.\* The Pope sent him the red hat, and it was assumed by Wolsey on the 18th of November, in Westminster Abbey, with great solemnity; he now called himself the Cardinal of York. The celebrated John Colet delivered a discourse, on this occasion, on the newly conferred dignity. Wolsey had already, in July, been made Lord Chancellor of the kingdom.†

Wolsey, like a true upstart, surrounded himself with unprecedented pomp and luxury. He was liberal towards scholars, and encouraged learning and art. With the King, who was sensual, masterful, and self-centred, he was on the best of terms; he understood thoroughly how to enter into all his inclinations. Yet with all the overmastering influence that he thus wielded, he was too clever to adhere obstinately to his own opinion. In such instances this proud and self-seeking man gave way to his master, and followed his views with the same eagerness which he would have shown had they originated from the first from himself. It was hard to say who was the real ruler, so completely did the King and his minister appear to be of one mind. The service of his Sovereign went before all else, even before the interests of the Church, with Wolsey. All his manifold gifts—as a statesman he developed an astonishing capacity—were dedicated practically to a single end; to raise the reputation and influence of his King, in whose exaltation his own was involved, and to make Henry VIII. the arbiter of Europe.‡ When Leo X., in 1518,

\* See Vol. VII. of this work, p. 118.

† Cf. BROSCHE, VI., 74.

‡ MARTIN, who brings this out strongly, remarks (p. 239) very



despatched Cardinal Campeggio to England to discuss the Turkish question, the latter was not received until he consented to share his legateship with Wolsey: Leo had to give way, as he had also sacrificed Cardinal Adriano Castellesi to the English Lord Chancellor. The latter expressed his thankfulness that thereby the whole work of pacification had been taken out of the Pope's hands and that all the glory of it would be secured to the King.\*

After that Rome knew what to expect of Wolsey: no wonder that the indefinite extension of his legatine powers was resisted; a Bull of the 6th of January, 1520, limited this extension to two years.† The English Cabinet on its side considered itself injured by the Pope's attitude towards the question of the Imperial succession.‡

The somewhat strained relations between Rome and England were exchanged in the following year for most friendly ones, in consequence of the rapprochement between Leo and Wolsey and of the determined opposition of Henry VIII. to Luther.§ On the 12th of May, 1521, in St. Paul's Churchyard, close to the famous St. Paul's Cross, in presence of a great multitude, the solemn publication of the Papal Brief against Luther took place along with the

pertinently of this policy: En général, on peut la définir une altitude à la fois indépendante et protectrice, orthodoxe assurément et même avec certaines parades de zèle, qu'on aurait tort d'appeler hypocrites, mais qu'il serait naïf de croire entièrement désintéressées. Le but réel de Wolsey, but auquel il n'a cessé d'appliquer toutes les ressources d'une intelligence supérieure, et d'une volonté tenace, c'est de rendre Henri VIII. arbitre de l'Europe, en favorisant tour à tour les deux rivaux qui se disputaient l'hégémonie du continent, Charles-Quint et François I.

\* Cf. Vol. VII. of this work, pp. 239, 241-243.

† RYMER, VI., I, 191; cf. Busch, *Vermittlungspolitik*, 82-83.

‡ Cf. CREIGHTON, V., 102; MARTIN, 340 *seq.*

§ Cf. BALAN, *Mon. ref.*, n. 83.

burning of his writings. During these proceedings, at which John Fisher, Bishop of Rochester, delivered a long discourse, Wolsey bore himself as if the tiara, on which his ambition had long been fixed, were now resting on his head.\* The Venetian Envoy who relates this adds: a Brief has come from Rome with an extension of Wolsey's legatine authority. On the 12th of May, Henry VIII. announced to the Pope the despatch of a work which he had written against Luther.† This book, "A Defence of the Seven Sacraments against Luther," which was substantially the King's own work,‡ was not completed until the autumn. Wolsey, who had had a share in its composition, now renewed his endeavours at Rome to obtain for the King a title of honour similar to that of the Kings of France and Spain.§ On the 14th of September the English Envoy, Clerk, presented in private audience to the Pope the splendidly bound copy of the royal polemic,||

\* See the account in SANUTO, XXX., 314 *seq.*, and 342. Cf. BROWN, Venetian Calendar, 210-213; the mandate against Luther's books in WILKINS, III., 690 *seq.* Fisher's speech was expressly presented to Leo; see BALAN, Mon. ref., n. 98.

† MAI, Spicil., VI., xlv. *seq.*

‡ CREIGHTON, V., 163, n. 3; also BRIDGETT, The Defender of the Faith, in the Dublin Review, XIII. (1885), 243-268. Cf. LAEMMER, Vortrid. Theol., 14 *seq.*, and HEFELE-HERGENRÖTHER, IX., 587 *seq.*

§ The question came up in Consistory on June 10, 1521 (the minutes relating to it in the Acta Consist., which CREIGHTON, V., 321 *seq.*, gives as unpublished, were published long before by LAEMMER, Melet., 190 *seq.*) and again on June 14; see KALKOFF, Forschungen, 83. Henry VIII. had long wished for this; the subject had been treated of as early as 1515; see MARTÈNE-DURAND, III., 1274; BROSCHE, VI., 137.

|| This parchment codex is marked \*Cod. Vat., 3731. The binding is modern; according to ZANELLI (Bibl. Vat., 22; cf. Mélanges d'archéol., XIV., 372), the original costly binding was stolen during the sack of Rome. On fol. 1 is the following note: \*Anno Dom. millesimo quingentesimo vigesimo primo die XII. Octob. Sanctissimus

which is now exhibited in the Vatican Library along with its author's love-letters to Anne Boleyn. Leo X. read forthwith the first five pages, and expressed by words and gestures his great satisfaction. The Envoy then ventured to call the attention of His Holiness to the dedication, which ran, "England's King Henry sends Leo X. this work as a sign of faith and friendship." The Envoy wished to read aloud to the Pope, who was short-sighted, this dedication, written in small letters, but Leo seized the

in Christo pater et dom. dom. Leo divina providentia papa decimus consignavit nobis Laurentio Parmenio et Romulo Mamacino pontificiae bibliothecae custodibus hunc librum in eadem bibliotheca cum aliis asservandum et custodiendum. Fol. 2 displays a beautiful miniature : two angels support the King's arms ; then follows the title : Assertio || septem sacramentorum ad || versus Martin. Lu || therum aedita ab || invictissimo || Angliae || et || Franciae rege et do. Hyberniae Hen || rico eius nominis octavo ||. Below the English arms are repeated, with a griffin and a dog as supporters, and surrounded by flowers. Fol. 3-4, dedication from Henry VIII. to Leo. Fol. 4-5<sup>b</sup>, Ad lectores ; then the text. Fol. 87<sup>b</sup>, in another hand and smaller writing : Anglorum rex Henricus Leo decime mittit || Hoc opus et fidei testem et amicitie. Beneath the autograph signature : Henricus. The Vatican contains in addition to this copy several others of the King's work, namely : Membr., III., 1, magnificently bound in red satin but without the royal signature ; Membr., III., 2, parchment copy of the London edition of 1521, intended for the King of Portugal, with Henry's signature ; Membr., III., 3, also with Henry's signature, binding of the time of Paul III. ; Membr., III., 4, parchment copy with illuminations on the second page, a miniature representing the King on his knees presenting his book to the Pope, at the end the words : Anglorum Rex, etc., and the King's signature, like the others, certainly in his own hand. The differences in the signatures show that no stamping instruments were used. This copy was probably also intended for Leo himself, like the Cod. Vat. 3731, since he was presented both with a manuscript and a printed copy. I take this opportunity of thanking the Prefect of the Vatican, Father Ehrle, for the great kindness with which he gave me access to these and other rarities in the collection placed in his charge.



book eagerly and read quickly, more than once, the flattering dedication with expressions of approval; he then begged that he might have five or six copies for the Cardinals.\*

It was the wish of the English Envoy to be allowed to present the work again in open Consistory. This Leo declined, on the pretext that the presence of laymen on such an occasion might give rise to disagreeable discussions on the Lutheran question. Leo remaining inflexible, Clerk had to content himself with the permission to present the volume on October 2nd in a secret Consistory and to make a speech on the occasion.† As regards the title which he had been asked to bestow on Henry VIII., the Pope, ignoring the opposition of several Cardinals, showed himself compliant to the English wishes. A Bull of the 26th of October ‡ conferred on the King of England the proud title of "Defender of the Faith," which is still borne on the arms and coinage of English Sovereigns. Wolsey, with whom the whole concern originated, earned the cordial thanks of his delighted master.

The well-known gentleness of Leo X. and his goodness of heart were shown especially in his treatment of the Jews. Few Popes have favoured them as much as he, at whose Court Jewish doctors and musicians held high and conspicuous posts. Where Jews suffered injuries at the hands of Christians,

\* See Clerk's account in BREWER, III., n. 1656, and ELLIS, original letters, 3rd Series, I., 256.

† Cf. RAYNALDUS, 1521, n. 73; KALKOFF, *Forschungen*, 84; cf. 134 n. See also MARTIN, 344; Clerk's speech in \*Cod. Vat. 5313, f. 14 seq.

‡ RYMER, VI., I, 199 seq. Cf. Brief of November 4, 1521, in BREWER, III., n. 1740, and WILKINS, III., 695 seq. See further, FIDDES, 246 seq.; HERBERT, 104; and BUSCH, *Vermittlungspol.*, 158. The Consistorial transactions on October 11 and 26 are in LAEMMER, *Melet.*, 200; cf. also Tablet XCVII., 563 seq.



he showed himself their energetic protector. Many new privileges were added to those already existing; even the establishment of a Hebrew printing press in Rome was permitted. The historians of the Jewish community in that city cannot find sufficient words of praise to celebrate the happiness and security they then enjoyed.\* By various exemptions, which were intended to protect the Jews, especially in Rome, from unjust taxation, the hope was expressed that in this way that nation might be more easily won to the Christian faith.† Although the protection given to the Jews by the Pope was generous, he was, at the same time, often obliged to take steps against them.‡ In one special instance, when he learned that a Jewish book hostile to the faith had been published at Venice, he took stringent measures.§

While Leo X. sanctioned the cultus of the founder of the Servites, Filippo Benizi, and of the Seven Franciscan friars of Septa in Africa,|| he gave orders for the preparation of the process of canonization of Giovanni Capistrano, of the Florentine Archbishop, Antonino, of Lorenzo Giustiniani, and of the founder of the Minims,

\* VOGELSTEIN-RIEGER, II., 33 *seq.*; see further, *Rev. d'étud. juives*. XXI., 285 *seq.* Many details in the *Regest. Leonis X.*, e.g. n. 7801; \*Div. Cam., LXVII. *seq.*, 78, 90, 110<sup>b</sup>. Secret Archives of the Vatican and \*Cod. Barb. lat. 2428, f. 208.

† Div. Cam., LXVII., f. 110<sup>b</sup>. The presence of Leo X. at the baptism of several Jews in 1518 is mentioned by Paris de Grassis, ed. DELICATI-ARMELLINI, 67.

‡ *Cf.*, e.g., *Regest. Leonis X.*, n. 7504, 8238, 8853, and *Archiv für Kirchenrecht*, LIII., 19 *seq.* \*Brief to the Legate at Avignon, dat. May 19, 1518, Arm., XL., t. 3, n. 322. Secret Archives of the Vatican.

§ \*Brief May 25, 1518, to the Nuncio in Venice, Arm., XXXIX., t. 31, 1518, n. 48, and to the Doge, Arm. XL., t. 3, n. 331. Secret Archives of the Vatican.

|| BZOVIVS, 1516, n. 21; WADDING, XVI., 2nd ed., 7.

Francesco di Paula.\* The Pope would have liked above all to have lived to see the canonization of his fellow-countryman, Antonino. But since the examination was carried out with the greatest thoroughness, it was long in being brought to a conclusion.† In the canonization of Francesco di Paula, France took a special interest.‡ This was celebrated by the Pope on the 1st of May, 1519, in St. Peter's, with all the solemnity which, from of old, has accompanied this rite.§

Leo was liberal in the granting of indulgences. Many churches not only in Italy, but also in other countries, especially Germany, were richly endowed in this respect.¶ Indulgences were also attached to the devotion of the Stations of the Cross, and to the confraternity of the Rosary,¶

\* Cf. SANUTO, XXVI., 212, XXVII., 103, 117, 145, 169, 184, 195, 250, XXVIII., 135, 137, XXIX., 474-475; WADDING, XVI., 2nd ed., 105 *seq.*, 122 *seq.*, 126 *seq.*; Acta Tomic., IV., 256, 401 *seq.* and V., 187; KALKOFF, Forschungen, 53, 70, 72 *seq.*, 75.

† On November 18, 1518, \*Francesco Chierigati told the Marquis of Mantua that in the last Consistory the canonization of Antonino had been discussed. But on the 17th and 23rd of December 1520, \*Fabrizio Pellegrino still speaks of the protracted proceedings in connection with it. Gonzaga Archives, Mantua. Cf. also KALKOFF, Forschungen, 35.

‡ KALKOFF, Forschungen, 35.

§ Cf. Paris de Grassis in RAYNALDUS, 1519, n. 82, and Notic. des Ms. du Roi, II., 592 *seq.*; Bull. V., 717 *seq.*; SANUTO, XXVII., 274 *seq.*, 297. For the canonization of Osanna Andreasia, see *supra*, p. 224 n., also LUZIO, Isabella d'Este, 75. For the refusal of Leo X. to permit the publication of the Caeremoniale by Cr. Marcello, see Paris de Grassis in HOFFMANN, 488 *seq.*; Notic. des Ms. du Roi, II., 586 *seq.*; HEFELE-HERGENRÖTHER, VIII., 680 *seq.*; BÄUMER, 382 (for Crassis read Grassis), and DUC DE RIVOLI, 381 *seq.* For the Institutio anniversarii pro omnibus papis, 1518, cf. GATTICUS, 476 *seq.*

¶ Cf. BELLESHEIM in the Histor-polit. Bl., CVIII., 738 *seq.*, and especially SCHULTE, I., 67 *seq.*

¶ Cf. Regest. Leonis X., n. 14237-14238, 14627; Bull. V., 757 *seq.*; Bull. ord. praedic., IV., 392; MOCHEGANI A MONSANO, Collectio

as well as to the famous pilgrimages to Aix la Chapelle and Treves.\*

In special Bulls Leo regulated the position of the Auditors of the Rota, of the College of the Abbreviators of the Apostolic letters, and of the clerical chamberlains, as well as the oath of obedience of the Bishops to the Holy See.† The laws of Julius II. against duelling were renewed with sharper penalties.‡ A special Bull dealt with magic and fortune-telling.§ Leo X. had also repeatedly enforced the Church's noble privilege of protecting the liberty of the human race and vindicating its dignity. A difference of opinion among the American missionaries as to the lot of the natives, called from the Pope the declaration that not only religion, but nature itself, protested against slavery. He entered into negotiations with King Ferdinand of Spain with a view to restraining the settlers from acts of violence and injustice towards the Indians.|| Further, the Pope was unremitting in his endeavours to ransom Christian captives of the Turks.¶

On several occasions the care of the churches of the East called for the Pope's attention. The restoration of union with the Maronites in the Council of the Lateran

indulgent. (*Ad Clarus Aquas*, 1897), 503; *Stimmen aus Maria-Laach*, LIII. (1897), 336 *seq.*; H. KOCH, *Zur. Gesch. der marianischen Bruderschaften*, Frankfurt, 1898, 12.

\* For Leo's patronage of the pilgrimage to Aix, see BEISSEL, *Heilgenverehrung*, II., 141; for Treves, *Regest. Leonis X.*, n. 13852.

† Bull. V., 566 *seq.*, 631 *seq.*, 684 *seq.*

‡ Bull. V., 727 *seqq.* Cf. *Zeitschrift. für kathol. Theol.*, 1898, 637 *seq.*

§ Bull. V., 571 *seqq.* Cf. HERGENRÖTHER, *Staat und Kirche*, 610.

|| Cf. MARGRAF, *Kirche und Sklaverei seit der Entdeckung Amerikas*, Tübingen, 1865, 81.

¶ Cf. *Regest. Leonis X.*, n. 3471, 3994, 4559, 5056, 5261, 5500, 5585, 6798, 12747.



has already been mentioned. The return to union of other orientals as well was then a matter of consideration.\* The repeated attempts to draw nearer to Russia miscarried completely, partly owing to unfavourable circumstances and partly in consequence of a mistaken appreciation of the circumstances. Iacopo Piso, who was appointed Nuncio in 1514, had as little success as his successors, Schönberg and Ferreri; none of these Envoys reached Moscow.†

The Uniat Greeks who were subjects of the Venetian Government were treated by Leo with good-will and entire loyalty. As early as 1513 the Pope had made efforts to settle the disputes in Rhodes between Latins and Greeks.‡ Leo repeatedly took steps against the Catholic clergy in Corfu, who wished to force the Greeks into conformity with these rites, just as he took the Greeks in Venice under his special protection.§ Since the oppression of the Greeks by the Latin clergy in the Venetian possessions, especially Corfu, continued, Leo issued, on the 18th of May, 1521, a very strongly-worded Bull, in which he renewed all the existing rights and privileges of the Greeks, and

\* Cf. Regest. Leonis X., n. 15691, cf. 15690. See also LAEMMER, Melet. 447, and *supra*, p. 403.

† Cf. the detailed description of PIERLING, I., 260-275. Here (278 *seq.*) there is further information about the private enterprises of Paoletto Centurione, which Leo supported. Cf. also FIEDLER, Ein Versuch der Vereinigung der russischen Kirche, Wien, 1862; PICHLER, II., 62 *seq.*; Mitteil. des österr. Instituts, XI., 76 *seq.*; BUDDEE, 35 *seq.*, 54 *seq.*; Amat di S. Filippo, Bibliografia di viaggiatori, 2nd ed. (1882), 223 *seq.*, 229 *seq.*; UEBERSBERGER, Oesterreich und Russland, I., Wien, 1906, 149 *seq.*

‡ Regest. Leonis X., n. 3045.

§ *Ibid.*, n. 5049, 9124; Bull. Propag. App., I., 14 *seq.*; LEBRET, Magazin, II., 565 *seq.* Cf. PISANI in the Revue d'hist. et de litt. relig., 1896, 205 *seqq.*



severely condemned the hostility of the Latins. It was laid down that Greek bishops should not ordain Latin clerics nor Latin bishops Greeks. The Latin priests were strictly forbidden to celebrate Mass in Greek churches. No one must condemn or despise the Greek ritual, which had been approved by the Council of Florence. Where two Bishops were co-resident, a Latin and a Greek, each was to abstain from interference in the other's affairs. In spite of the heavy penalties attached to the infraction of these decrees, both Clement VII., and Paul III. at a later date, had to come to the help of the Greeks.\*

In maintaining the integrity of the faith, the Pope continued to employ the Dominicans as Inquisitors.† In Italy, in 1513, 1515, and 1516, he was forced to take steps against several fanatical preachers, two of whom—Teodoro of Scutari and Fra Bonaventura—gave themselves out to be the Angelic Pope foretold by Savonarola. Fra Bonaventura, who preached downright apostasy from the Church, laid the Pope under excommunication and announced his speedy death, was imprisoned in St. Angelo in May, 1516, whereupon the bulk of his followers fell away.‡ The

\* Besides HEFELE-HERGENRÖTHER, VIII., 691, *cf.* now the interesting treatise of E. V. GÖDEL-LANNOY, *Die kirchliche Verhältnisse auf Corfu zur Zeit der venet. Herrschaft*, Graz, 1904.

† *Cf.* Bull. ord. praedic., IV., 303 *seq.*, 356 *seqq.*, 373 *seqq.*

‡ For him and other fanatics, see Vol. V. of this work, 221–225. In the Brief of April 17, 1515, Leo X. congratulates himself on the action of the Florentine Archbishop against “Theodorum perdit. filium qui audens sedem ad Aquilonem ponere sibi Angelici pastoris nomen usurpabat, etc.” (MORENI, II. 512). For Fra Bonaventura, see SANUTO, XVIII., 139; HÖFLER, *Ital. Zustände*, 56–57, and Vol VII. of this work, p. 156, n., from \*Paris de Grassis. For a Frate di San Francesco proceeded against by Leo in August 1516, on account of prophesying, see SANUTO, XXII., 474; *ibid.*, XXI., 338 *seq.* for a half-crazy preacher in Venice.

prompt suppression of this fanatical movement may have led many to hope that similar measures would be applied to Martin Luther, whose appearance followed shortly after, and that his agitation would thus be brought to a speedy end. That Leo X. and his chief adviser, Cardinal Medici, did not share such illusions, is shown by their action with regard to the Wittenberg Professor, which has already been described.\* But they certainly did not recognize the full bearing of the movement which had broken out in Germany.

Still less did Rome recognize the danger which threatened the Church in Scandinavia. Here also as in other countries a profound impression was made by the appointment to Church benefices of strangers and courtiers, who drew the revenues and neglected the duties. Although the Danish clergy made just complaints,† no redress was given. In February, 1520, Leo even went so far as to bestow the rich Archbishopric of Lund on Cardinal Cesi.‡ A mistake of equal magnitude was the despatch of the Papal chaplain, Giovanni Maria Arcimboldi, as Nuncio to the northern kingdoms; he was at the same time to proclaim an Indulgence for the building of St. Peter's.§ How unscrupulously this was done by his covetous agent, Leo was afterwards informed by Raffaello de' Medici. The latter wrote from Worms in the beginning of 1521 that the Princes were specially embittered towards this prelate, who had "in a thousand instances done the most useless things, and with the help of the Capuchins had raked in

\* Vol. VII. of this work, Chap. VIII., Part I.

† Cf. SCHÄFER, *Geschichte Danemark*, IV., 23.

‡ CIACONIUS, III., 395; SCHÄFER, IV., 139.

§ For Arcimboldi and his mission, see MARTIN, *G. Vasa*, 65 *seq.*, 71 *seq.*; also cf. SCHULTE, I., 151. PAULUS in the *Theol. Revue*, 1904, 542.

all the money he could lay his hands on.”\* Paul Eliesen said later: “Arcimboldi’s gross abuse of power and of his commission gave Lutheranism its opportunity in Denmark; there had been Roman Legates in Denmark before who did useful and edifying work, but Arcimboldi’s mission was a scandal, and set at naught all religion and the fear of God.”†

At the close of 1516 Arcimboldi arrived in Denmark. The King was the gifted but autocratic Christian II., whose ambition was the restoration of the Union of Kalmar. To him Arcimboldi had to pay 1120 Rhenish florins in order to obtain permission to publish the Indulgence.‡ In 1518 he went on to Sweden, where the higher clergy, and particularly the Archbishop of Upsala, Gustav Trolle, took Christian’s side in opposition to the Swedish vice-regent Sten Sture. Arcimboldi, before he left Denmark, had given a promise to Christian that he would use his influence on his behalf in Sweden; he did the reverse. Sten Sture knew how to reach his man on his weak side; rich presents and large promises took the Nuncio completely captive. He did not scruple to disclose to the Regent the secret connections which Christian had with Sweden! When the Archbishop of Upsala was dismissed from the Swedish Reichstag, on account of his Danish sympathies, the Nuncio also acquiesced in this dismissal.§

King Christian took his revenge, for in April, 1518, he confiscated all the money and property in kind which Arcimboldi had left behind in Denmark or sent thither from Sweden;

\* KALKOFF, *Depeschen und Berichte über Luther*, 39, *cf.* 94.

† SCHÄFER, IV., 125.

‡ SCHULTE, I., 152; PALUDAN-MÜLLER, 327.

§ *Cf.* DAHLMANN, *Gesch. von Danemark*, III., 331; WEIDLING, *Schwedische Reformationsgeschichte*, 32, 40.



at the same time the Nuncio's brother and servant were thrown into prison. Neither protests nor entreaties were of the least avail: the Papal representative must have been glad to have had the good luck to reach Lubeck even with empty hands.\* In Rome, where King Christian had accused him of intriguing and treachery, his recall was demanded. Arcimboldi replied by asserting his innocence: as the originator of the calumnies he indicated his former secretary, Dietrich Slageck, a Westphalian. The latter gained a decided influence over King Christian; he had complained at Rome of the Archbishop's dismissal, and had succeeded in having the Regent put under the ban. As the executioner of this penalty, Christian began war with Sweden. In January, 1520, when the countless lakes and marshes of that country were covered over with hard ice, he opened his campaign and won a victory, with great bloodshed, on the frozen lake of Asunden, near Bogesund; Sten Sture succumbed to his grievous wounds. At Whitsuntide Christian appeared with his fleet before Stockholm. The city capitulated, after Christian had given a written promise that all that had been done against him and the prelates, especially Archbishop Trolle, would be forgiven. The provinces followed the capital, and Christian returned to Copenhagen as King of Sweden. Here he determined to secure for himself, by one bold stroke, absolute sovereignty over Sweden. Dietrich Slageck showed him how, without breaking his pledge of pardon, he might yet exterminate his enemies. A distinction, said Slageck, must be drawn between the King, who can and must pardon what concerns himself, and the executioner of the Papal Bull against all those who took part in the deposition of the Archbishop of

\* SCHULTE, I., 153. Antonelli Arcimboldi was set at liberty by the end of 1523, see Dipl. Norveg., n. 191.



Upsala. Christian acted accordingly; at the end of October he landed in Stockholm from his fleet of war; on the 8th of November, without judicial trial and in breach of his royal word—which had guaranteed an amnesty to all persons compromised—he ordered ninety-four Swedes of the highest rank and office, who were opponents of the Danish rule, to be beheaded on the Stortorget or market-place of Stockholm; they were not given time to make confession before they died. Many more executions followed until the number amounted to six hundred. Among the victims were the Bishops Matthias of Strengnäs and Vincent of Skara.\*

Soon after the massacre of Stockholm, Christian begged his uncle, the Elector Frederick of Saxony, to send him some theologians of the school of Luther and Carlstadt to Copenhagen. In response came Martin Reinhard at the end of 1520; the latter, however, disappointed the expectations of the King to such a degree that he was soon sent back to Germany. Christian did not on this account abandon his plan of separating the Danish Church from Rome, and, by bringing it into subjection to himself, legally as well as practically, strengthening thereby his sovereign power. He did not merely call in the aid of Carlstadt; he ordered the construction of a new legal code whereby a state church might be formally established in Denmark. All appeals to Rome were forbidden; instead, a privy tribunal was to be created in Denmark from which appeals could be made to the King and the Reichsrath only. The clergy were prohibited from acquiring property unless, "in accordance with the teaching of St. Paul" (1 Tim.), they married. No one should be ordained sub-deacon or deacon before the age of five-and-twenty, or priest before

\* DAHLMANN, III., 335 *seq.*, 343 *seq.* Cf. also SCHUMACHER on Olaus Magnus, in *Zeitschr. f. Erdkunde*, XXVIII., 175 *seq.*

the age of thirty. The man at whose instigation the massacre of Stockholm had taken place, was appointed successor to the murdered Bishop of Skara.\*

How did Leo act towards the arbitrary rule of the despotic King? He decided to send, in the person of the Minorite Francesco de Potentia, a new Nuncio to Copenhagen, to call Christian to account for the execution of the two Bishops; but the envoy was instructed not to make the absolution of the King for his offence too difficult, lest the latter should, in defiance or despair, adhere to the Lutheran teaching.† Francesco de Potentia appeared in Copenhagen at the end of November, 1521. The King now threw all the blame on Slageck, who, in the meantime, had been raised to the Archbishopric of Lund. The latter did not enjoy his new honours long. In January, 1522, as ringleader in the butchery of Stockholm, on the same spot where his victims had been done to death, he made just expiation for his crime on the scaffold. The Nuncio now absolved the King, who repudiated his Lutheran sympathies;‡ as his reward Francesco received the Bishopric of Skara.§ When the Pope and his representative thus acted, was not the King justified in thinking that all things were permitted him? Heavy as his guilt may have been, a portion of it falls on Pope Leo and his adviser. There is thus justification for the severe verdict that Christian would never have acted as he did if Leo had

\* DAHLMANN, III., 350 *seq.*, 356 *seq.*; PALUDAN-MÜLLER, 379 *seq.*

† Besides SCHULTE, I., 154, *cf.* also KALKOFF, *Forschungen*, 83-84. For Francesco de Potentia, *cf.* MARTIN, 123 *seq.* He held the Bishopric of SKARA not then but on May 15, 1523; see MARTIN, 127, and \*Acta consist. vicec. in the Consistorial Archives of the Vatican.

‡ *Cf.* SCHÄFER, IV., 132.

§ DAHLMANN, 355 *seq.*; PALUDAN-MÜLLER, 405 *seq.*

fulfilled his duty and defended the Church of the north with determination against the arbitrary attacks of the secular power.\*

In many ways the Pope busied himself with the affairs of the regular clergy. It is matter of rejoicing that he made repeated and energetic efforts to reform the discipline of the cloister. Successful, however, as these efforts were in individual cases, they were not sufficient to cope with deeply-rooted evils of long standing.† Leo showed

\* *Cf.* *Histor.-Polit. Blätter*, CVI., 352 *seq.*

† *Cf.* *Bull. ord. praedic.*, IV., 301 *seq.*, 312 *seq.*, 321 *seq.*, 325 *seq.*, 341 *seq.*, 365 *seq.*, 379 *seq.*; *WADDING*, XVI., 2nd ed., 83 *seq.*, 84 *seq.*, 87 *seq.*, 101 *seq.*; *HEFELE-HERGENRÖTHER*, VIII., 767 *seq.*; *Regest. Leonis X.*, n. 3633 *seqq.*, 3687, 3852, 4865, 7553, 7705, 12012, 12363, 17602; *Mitteil. aus d. Benediktinerorden*, XXI., 331; *GAR*, *Annali di Trento*, Trento, 1860, 423; *MARTINI*, *Beschreibung des Klosters Engelthal* (1789), 39; *HAUPT*, *Sekten*, 56, n.; *Corp. dipl. Port*, I., 435 *seq.*, 461 *seq.*, *SANUTO*, XXV., 390. Much material on this subject is unpublished. I noted in the Secret Archives of the Vatican: *Arm.*, XXXIX, t. 31, 1515, n. 115, \**Episcopo Vercellen. sup. reformat. frat. ord. praed. Bugellae Vercell. dioc.*, dat. 1515, December 25; 1516, n. 119, \**Reform of the Nuns (Cisterc.)*, *Savonen. dioc.*, dat. 1516, September 30; t. 32, f. 214<sup>b</sup>, \**Episcopo Fulgin.*, dat. 1518, July 15 (Punishment of a bad Monk); f. 66, 227, 230, \**Reform of the Dominicans*, dat. 1518, March 23, June 15, August 24; f. 174, *Reform of the Poor Clares in Ascoli*, 1518, June 29; f. 232, *Reform of the Clares in the Diocese of Rieti*, 1518, November 4; f. 151, \**Episcopo Tarvisin.* (*Reform of the Convents of Nuns*), 1518, June 12. *National Archives, Paris*: L. 357, \**Brief to Ant. Du Prat*, dat. Rome, 1518, July 27, *Reform of the Carmelites*. *National Library, Paris*: Lat. 13846, f. 153, \**Bulla Leonis X.*, pro *reformat. monast. S. Petri Lugdun.*, dat. *Romae*, 1516, Quinto Id. Junii. *Communal Library, Perugia*; \**Brief to Cardinal Passerini*, dat. *Rom*, 1521, October 20, stringent orders for the reform of monasteries. *Classense Library, Ravenna*: \**Commissione di Leone X. al patriarca Ant. Contarini*, to inquire into monastic life in Venice, especially the Benedictines of *S. Maria a Coelestibus*; \**Brief to Franc. de Ferrara*, June 24, 1518, in *Appendix No. 11*. *State Archives, Milan*.

special favour to the newly-founded order of the Minims; but his benevolent protection was also extended to the Augustinian Hermits, the Carmelites, the Benedictine congregation of S. Giustina, and the order of St. Dominic. He restored the order of St. Lazarus which Innocent VIII. had dissolved in Italy, and also confirmed finally the statutes of the French order of the Annunciation.\*

Leo's measures as regards the Franciscan order were of the greatest importance. Julius II. had already endeavoured to bring all the branches of this order under one general; but he was unable to overcome the opposition of the Observantines.† Leo was not more successful than his energetic predecessor. In the general chapter held in Rome at Whitsuntide, 1517, he certainly made one more attempt to unite the different observances. This having failed, he determined on a complete separation of the Order so as to put an end to the continued dissensions. In two Papal constitutions it was enacted that all Franciscan houses which wished to retain their privileges should become separate from those which refused to permit any dispensation from the rule. The latter were amalgamated in one body, and along with them four minor reforms coalesced; viz. those of the Clares, Colettines, Amadeans, and two "custodi" of the discalced friars in Spain and Portugal. The Observantines who were thus united had to choose a head for six years, to whom the ancient seal of the order was to be given and who should bear the title of "General of the whole Order of Franciscans." The Conventuals had their privileges confirmed, especially

\* Cf. Bull. V., 692 *seq.*; HEFELE-HERGENRÖTHER, VIII., 768 *seq.*; HEIMBUCHER, I., 227, 522, *cf.* 368 *seq.* for support of the Third orders. For favours shown to the Order of the Holy Ghost, *cf.* BRUNE, *Ordre du Saint-Esprit*, Paris, 1892, 240.

† Cf. Vol. VI. of this work, 444.



the right of holding landed property and rentals and of choosing their own superior-general.\*

Leo's appointments to the Sacred College, especially those of the great creation of 1517, have been so thoroughly treated of already,† that only a retrospective glance is here necessary.

In the eight promotions of the Pope's reign two-and-forty prelates received the purple.‡ To his contemporaries it seemed remarkable that each of the four great orders, the Benedictines, Augustinians, Dominicans, and Franciscans, should each have a Cardinal.§ As regards nationality, the Italians were preponderant. Of the one-and-thirty new Italian Cardinals, eight were Romans (Francesco Conti, Giandomenico de Cupis, Andrea della Valle, Pompeo Colonna, Domenico Jacobazzi, Franciotto Orsini, Paolo Emilio Cesi, and Alessandro Cesarini), seven were Florentines (Lorenzo Pucci, Giulio de' Medici, Niccolò Pandolfini, Ferdinando Ponzetti, Luigi de' Rossi, Giovanni Salviati, and Niccolò Ridolfi), four others were Tuscans, (Bernardo Bibbiena, Giovanni Piccolomini, Raffaello Petrucci, and Silvio Passerini), five came from the States of

\* See JEILER in *Kirchenlex.*, IV., 2nd ed., 1666 *seq.* Cf. IX., 636 *seq.*, and HEIMBUCHER, I., 310 *seq.*

† See Vol. VII. of this work, p. 199 *seq.*

‡ Cf. \*Contelorius, *De pontif et cardinal.* XI., 48 (Secret Archives of the Vatican). Not five-and-forty, as had often been stated, since the nomination of Fr. Quirini is uncertain; the Archbishop of Toulouse, Jean d'Orléans, and Ant. Sanseverino were not published. CIACONIUS, III., 308 *seqq.*, 421 *seqq.*; cf. \*Diary in Cod. Barb. lat. 5352 of the Vatican Library. Twenty-six Cardinals died under Leo X.; forty-eight were alive at his death; cf. CIACONIUS, III., 422, 425 Cf. also CARDELLA, IV., 1-78, who gives copious but not always reliable information of the lives of the several Cardinals; see also PANVINIUS, 19 *seq.*, 27 *seq.*, and *Notic. des Mss. du Roi*, II., 585 *seq.*

§ Fra Gratia de Francia, a Franciscan, calls attention to this. \*Cod. Urb. 1023, f. 341<sup>b</sup>, Vatican Library.

the Church (Lorenzo Campeggio, Francesco Armellini, Cristoforo Numai, Egidio Canisio, and Ercole Rangoni), the rest from Genoa (Innocenzo Cibo and Giambattista Pallavicini), Piedmont (Bonifacio Ferreri), Milan (Scaramuccia Trivulzio and Agostino Trivulzio), Venice (Francesco Pisani), and Gaeta (Tommaso de Vio). The non-Italian Cardinals, in whose nominations the variations in the Papal policy were to some extent reflected, were the Englishman Wolsey (1515), the Frenchmen Adrien Gouffier de Boissy (1515), Antoine Bohier Du Prat (1517),\* Louis de Bourbon (1517),† and Jean de Lorraine,‡ the Netherlands Guillaume de Croy (1517), Adrian of Utrecht (1517), and Eberhard de la Mark (1520), the German Albert of Brandenburg§ (1518), the Spaniard Raymond de Vich (1517), and Don Alfonso, the son of the Portuguese King (1517).

It is a characteristic of the reign of Leo that, in filling up vacancies in the Cardinalate, he was guided chiefly by political and personal motives. Thus there were introduced into the highest Council of the Church many unworthy members who were blemishes on the credit and dignity of

\* Cf. Vol. VII. of this work, p. 459, the \*letter of A. Gabbioneta, April 1, 1517. Gonzaga Archives, Mantua.

† Bourbon's nomination, with that of Croy, followed on April 1, 1517. His publication, which Ciaconius (III., 345) could not substantiate, took place on May 25, 1517; see \*Diary in Cod. Barb. lat. 3552, Vatican Library.

‡ ULMANN in Archiv f. Ref.-Geschs., II., 180. The text of the \*Brief to Lorenzo de' Medici, May 28, 1518 (Secret Archives of the Vatican), in Appendix, No. 10.

§ Leo's Brief relating to the bestowal of the insignia on Albert of Brandenburg, dated August 23, 1518, was published by A. SCHULTE in the Studien aus Kunst und Geschichte, Freiburg, 1906, 203 *seq.*, along with the list of faculties which the Cardinal wished the Curia to confer on him. Schulte here points out the consequences which would have ensued if Albert, as he wished, had been made Papal Legate in Germany.

the purple. Yet in this respect the great creation of 1517 was a turning point for the better.\*

In the same year in which this Consistory was held, the great apostasy from Rome began in Germany, presenting to the Church tasks unknown before. That Leo grasped this situation cannot be asserted. To the necessity of ecclesiastical reform he certainly did not shut his eyes, but at this critical moment in affairs he acted, as in so many other matters, like an intellectual dilettante and never went below the surface. The anti-Papal movement in Germany could only be successfully met by the counter-acting force of trenchant reform. To this Leo was blind; while the tempest was ready to break in which a third part of Europe was to be torn from the chair of St. Peter, he gave himself up with a light and joyous mind and without anxiety to the enjoyments and preoccupations of the world. In all respects a true child of the Renaissance, Leo, surrounded by his artists, poets, musicians, actors, buffoons and other parasites of a court, flung himself with a terrible nonchalance into the vortex of secularity without troubling himself to ask whether such pursuits were in accordance or not with his position as a spiritual ruler. Neither the warlike complications of Europe, nor the Turkish peril, nor the rise of a new heresy disturbed him amid his favourite pastimes or the gratification of his intellectual tastes. His Court, with its lavish expenditure on wholly secular objects, the card-table, the theatre, the chase, stood in sharp contradiction to the aims and calling of a great dignitary of the Church. Under Alexander VI. there was certainly a greater depravity of morals, but it is hard to say whether the subtle worldliness of Leo X. was not an evil more difficult to encounter and of greater danger to the Church.

\* Cf. REUMONT, III., 2, 270, and Vol. VII. of this work, p. 204 *seq.*

Only a few of his contemporaries realized this. They had become so accustomed to the growing secularity of the Popes of the Renaissance, that they judged Leo X. only by the standards of a temporal prince. Thus Guicciardini only speaks of him as a sovereign who had many praiseworthy and many blameable characteristics.\* Vettori also starts from this standpoint; he begins by remarking that he will not attempt to balance Leo's faults and virtues; then he corrects himself and thus gives his verdict: "Even if Leo X. did amuse himself with jesters, he yet had so many good qualities that men might well be satisfied with such a prince."† Both these writers—Vettori and Guicciardini—speak only of the "Principe," of the politician, not of the Pope and not even of the Maecenas of art. Giovio, who has drawn the traditional portrait of Leo, takes a higher standpoint. His pen is not that of a mere flatterer; this talented humanist portrays rather the kindred spirit, the man who reflected, as in a mirror, the most vital, the freest, the most perfect traits of the Renaissance. Giovio thought himself entitled to end his biography with the words: "Leo's lofty spirit (*virtus*) brought back to us the golden age for the healing of the human race; now that this great prince has departed, we perforce must mourn under an age of iron inasmuch as, through our mistakes and failures, barbarous savagery has brought upon us murder, pestilence, hunger, desolation—in short, all human evils; knowledge, art, the common well-being, the joy of living—in a word, all good things have gone down into the grave along with Leo."‡

If Giovio says nothing of Leo as a spiritual ruler, he is

\* GUICCIARDINI, XIV., 4.

† VETTORI, 339-340.

‡ Vita Leonis X., I., 4. For the sense of "*virtus*," see BURCKHARDT, I., 7th ed., 159.



so far in correspondence with fact, for the mainspring of this Pontiff's actions certainly did not lie in the ecclesiastical sphere. Judges whose eyes are fixed solely on the interests of the Church, like Cardinals Seripando\* and Pallavicini,† cannot but censure Leo severely. But even if we take a wider survey and weigh his services in the cause of human culture, a closer examination convinces us that in this respect also the Leonine era was not, as it has for so long been assumed to be, the type of the highest and most flawless product of literature, knowledge, and art. And yet within this domain Leo rendered services which must always be taken into account in forming a general estimate of his place in history.

If on many points the last word has not yet been spoken over the Medici Pope, it may yet be safely asserted at the present stage of inquiry that his Pontificate, praised to exaggeration by humanists and poets, and lit up by the beams of Raphael's art, was, in consequence of its too free surrender to secular tendencies, whereby the Church was thrown into the background to make way for her brilliant forms of culture, one of momentous import for the Holy See.

\* Cf. HÖFLER, *Analekten*, 51 *seq.*!

† *Istoria del Conc. di Trento*, I., 2.



APPENDIX  
OF  
UNPUBLISHED DOCUMENTS  
AND  
EXTRACTS FROM ARCHIVES.





## APPENDIX.

---

### I. POPE LEO X. TO CARDINAL FARNESE.\*

1513, Julii 20, Rom.

Dilecte fili. Venationis tue quam in Farnesianis et Vulsiniensibus tuis satis feliciter atque ex sententia egisti primitias ut scribis ad nos per te missas accepimus hilariter una cum litteris elegantissime scriptis, que nos certe non minus munere ipso delectarunt, tuum enim et ingenuum animum et amantem nostri quem nos propter divitias bonarum artium et litterarum confectas et constipatas in eo semper in honore habuimus, totum nobis expressere. Et quidem fasianis illis expetitis peregre et advectitiis avibus, que propter saporis prestantiam regum mensas lautius instruere solent, nullum suavius condimentum quam eiusmodi epistule adiungi potuit; delectasti igitur et palatum nostrum aviculis et aurem stilo. Sed harum delectationum alteram a multis expectare possumus, alteram que animi tota est, a te precipue. Utinam liceret nobis tecum una eadem quam tu sequeris frui libertate, ad quam tu nos quidem vel honori auctoritati unitas [sic] acciperes enim nos sepe duplici convivio neque ita multis interpellantibus. Verum ut ad propositum redeamus, ea carere libertate, minus moleste feremus, si huiusmodi quandoque a te munuscula accipiemus.

Datum Rome die XX iulii 1513 anno primo.

[Sec. Arch. of the Vatican, Arm. 44, t. 5. f. 12<sup>b</sup>.]

\* See *supra*, p. 157.

## 2. POPE LEO X. TO BOLOGNA.\*

1514, Februar. 19, Rom.

Dilect. ect. Ut ad nostrum Romanum gymnasium, quantum fieri potest, perfectas litterarias disciplinas accersiremus idque studium excellentibus doctoribus honestaremus, deputaveramus ad lectionem ordinariam philosophie inter alios doctos eximiosque viros dil. fil. Ioannem de Montesdocca,† cui diebus elapsis scripsimus ut dimissis omnibus aliis lectionibus ad nos se conferret, quem postea rescivimus esse pro presenti anno studio Bononiae obligatum etiam data fideiussione illi pro eo tempore non deesse. Quamobrem ne dispositioni huic nostre publicum commodum spectanti successus impediatur. He orders the above-named to free himself from these obligations, so that he may come to Rome without delay.

Dat. Romae apud s. Petrum sub anulo piscat. 1514, febr. 19, p. n. a° 1°.

P. Bembus.

[Orig. State Archives, Bologna.]

## 3. POPE LEO X. TO THE DUKE ALFONSO I. OF FERRARA.‡

1514, September 5, Rom.

Dilecte etc. Commisimus dil. filio Simoni Oricellario negotium fodiendi canalis s. Alberti de Ravenna, et quoniam cupimus huiusmodi opus sine dilatione perfici quia tempus fodiendi preteriret, te hortamur in domino, ut ad perfat. Simonem commiss. nostrum eo mittas decem viros ex illis, quos battifangos appellant, et quilibet eorum secum ducat ad minus quinquaginta operarios, quibus omnibus laboris sui iustum pretium dabitur, eritque nobis gratissimum si miseris cum eis ex tuis quempiam diligentem et industrium virum qui eos cogat et dirigat ad operandum.

Dat. Romae apud s. Petrum sub anulo piscat. die V sept. 1514, p. n. a° 2°.

P. Bembus.

[Orig. State Archives, Modena.]

\* See *supra*, pp. 250, 273.

† Cf. MARINI, Lettera, 40, 119.

‡ See *supra*, p. 127.

## 4. POPE LEO X. TO PIETRO BEMBO.\*

1515, Januar. 1, Rom.

Al diletto figliolo missier Pietro Bembo Medici patrizio Veneto, segretario nostro domestico. Leone Papa X<sup>mo</sup>. Al diletto figliolo salute ed apostolica benedizione. Molti segni vi abbiamo mostrato del nostro paterno amore e benevolenza verso di voi, non però maggiore delli vostri meriti e virtù, delle quali dall' Altissimo siete stato copiosamente adornato, ma nondimeno subito ascesi per Divina Provvidenza al pontificato, immediate spontaneamente vi chiamassimo al carico di nostro segretario, sforzandoci d'aumentarvi onori e dignità. Questo con l' aiuto di Dio faremo in appresso tanto più abbondantemente e con maggior magnificenza, onorando degnamente l' eccellenza del vostro pregiato ingegno e della vostra molta dottrina, di cui con ogni pienezza e grazia siete dotato. Ed in quanto poi al carico di segretario, è sì grande la vostra fede, integrità ed industria, che in quello, che vi si è dato per onore e beneficio vostro, pare assai più abbiamo avuto riguardo al comodo ed utile nostro, che alla dignità ed interesse vostro, non potendosi circa questa carica desiderare in altri cosa alcuna, che in voi non si trovi in ogni parte corrispondente e conforme alla grandezza e desiderio nostro. Onde quello che ben spesso deve tenersi secreto e nascosto, liberamente e volentieri a voi con tutta purità confidiamo, ed in quello che occorre trattare, negoziare e scrivere prudentemente ed elegantemente, sperimentiamo e vediamo in voi destrezza ed eloquenza amirabile e di nostra infinita sodisfazione. Che però da tante giuste cause tirati ad un paterno amore ed inclinazione verso di voi, quel che sperare e desiderare devesi da noi a suo tempo vi sarà benignamente e di buona voglia concesso. Intanto per verissimo testimonio e caparra di questa e per espressa dimostrazione della nostra benevolenza, desiderando stringervi a noi ed alla nostra casa con maggiori legami di parentella, ed insieme accrescere ornamento grande alla vostra onorevolezza, ed in parte anco alla nostra famiglia, della quale siamo, stimando esser cosa degna di principe, non meno aver per affini e congiunti quelli che sono di nobili e segnalate virtù fregiati, che gli altri, che la natura ha dato per parenti di sangue—conciosiacosachè questo avviene

\* See *supra*, p. 193.

per caso, e quello per propria elezione di giudizio—: voi, a noi per virtù caro e per amore unito e congiunto, riceviamo ed addottiamo nel nome, casa e famiglia nostra, concedendovi che possiate usare e godere delli medesimi onori, privilegi, immunità, precedenza, e preminenze, che godono ed usano tutti gli altri del nostro sangue e famiglia de Medici, e che possiate e dobiate chiamarvi ed intitolarvi Pietro Bembo de Medici, e col medesimo cognome esser chiamato ed intitolato dagli altri. Ed acciò, che non solo con il nome, ma ancora con altri segni e memorie apparisca tanto più questa nostra addottazione, vi concediamo, che possiate in ogni loco usare l'arma della nostra famiglia e comunicarla a vostri parenti della vostra medesima casa e cognome, in modo, che la vostra antica arma e de vostri sia circondata dalle nostre sei palle in campo di color d'oro per chiara espressione della benevolenza, con la quale vi abbracciamo nel seno della paterna carità, esortandovi nel Signore che con l'istesse virtù e meriti, con li quali vi siete fatto degno d'un aumento non ordinario d'onore e di sicura dimostrazione del nostro amore, operate in modo, che prima ringraziando Dio che tale vi ha fatto diventare ed acquistare tanta laude, ingegno, bontà e dottrina, non sia onore, benchè grande, che conferendovisi, non si stimi più presto degno premio della vostra virtù, che degno dell'altrui liberalità ed affetto. E poi servendo rettamente e fedelmente come fate a noi, la cui buona volontà avete già potuto in parte conoscere, ed in avvenire ne proverete frutti più abbondanti, non solo con quella fede, che si deve verso un padrone, ma con quell'amore che si richiede verso un principe affine e parente, procuriate la nostra ed insieme vostra gloria e dignità.

Data in Roma appresso S. Pietro sotto l'anello del pescatore, il primo gennaro 1515, del nostro pontificato l'anno secondo.

Jo. Sadoletus.

[Cop. Venice, Museo civico (Raccolta Cicogna, 510 f. 206<sup>b</sup>).\*]

\* Cf. the copy of Dom. Zasso, per *nozze* Dionisi-Bembo, Venezia, 1875, which is a bibliographical rarity.



## 5. THE "ORATORY OF DIVINE LOVE."

Among the Secret Archives of the Vatican is to be found in the *Polit. Varia*, LXXVIII, f. 233, f, a document entitled: \**"Origine et sommario delle opere pie di Roma instituite dal pontificato di Leone X. sino a Paolo IV.,"* containing the following notice about the "Oratory of Divine Love": \**Al tempo del detto pontificato (Leo X.) si ritrovava in Roma una certa secreta spirituale et christianissima compagnia, la quale era solita di congregarsi in S. Dorothea di Trastevere, dove intervenivano prelati et nobili et altre persone che si dilettauano del charitativo et spirituale essercitio, della qual compagnia tra gli altri signori et prelati era anchora mons. il vescovo di Chieti. . . . Onde da questa santa compagnia nacquero in processo di tempo molte opere pie in Roma et fuor di Roma per tutta Italia et non solamente per Italia, ma anchora fuori d'essa in molte provintie et regni della christianità. Hora essendo la detta compagnia un giorno congregata nella detta chiesa di S<sup>ta</sup> Dorothea al tempo del sopra detto papa Leone, fù fatta una proposta di questa natura, che conciofossecosa, che per le strade et piazze di Roma si vedesse ogni dì gran moltitudine et numero di poveri piagati posti quali in picciole carrette, quali per terra infestissimi al viso et all' odorato di tutto il mondo, onde nasceua che in Roma era quasi continuamente la peste, uno della detta compagnia exclamando alta voce addimandò in prestito cento ducati a rendergli in centuplo a chiunque gliele imprestasse, così uno de fratelli della compagnia prestò li cento ducati a colui che gli addimandava, il quale subito cominciò a far fondar l'edificio del venerabile hospitale di S. Jacomo degli incurabili nella strada del popolo, dove a mano a mano fù instituita una altra compagnia particolare per quel luogo, nella quale entrò papa Leone con tutto il collegio de cardinali et gran numero di prelati et di gentilhuomini, di sorte che vi si fece così gran ritratto di elemosine che incontinente si levarono tutti i piagati delle strade et delle piazze di Roma, et fù conosciuto che quelli cento ducati erano veramente moltiplicati in cento doppi, et hora si puo con verità affermare che fino al dì d'hoggi nell' edificio solo di quel luogo se ne sono spesi più di centomila ducati. Appresso la detta compagnia di S<sup>ta</sup> Dorothea prese animo da questa santissima opera degli Incurabili vedendola*

succeder felicemente, si deliberò di farne un'altra non meno utile et necessaria all'honore et servitio di N. S. Dio, et così fece fondare il venerabile monasterio delle convertite. Et la prima elemosina che diede principio, furono quaranta ducati di M. Mathia Aversa canonico di S. Lorenzo in Damaso, dopo li quali denari si trova essere stato speso in quel monasterio fino a questo dì più di 60<sup>m</sup> ducati. Quasi nel medesimo tempo fù istituita anchora la venerabile compagnia della Charità, la quale prese la cura et il governo delle dette convertite. Nella qual compagnia sono molti s<sup>ri</sup> cardinali et prelati et gentilhomini et ufficiali et mercanti di buon nome, con la protettione d'un cardinale che al presente è mons<sup>r</sup> r<sup>mo</sup> Morone.\*

#### 6. ALESSANDRO GABBIONETA TO THE MARQUIS OF MANTUA.†

1517, Januar. 14, Rom.

. . . Ali dui de marzo prox<sup>o</sup> futuro se farà lultima sessione del concilio Lateranensis, el quale se absolverà et se serrerà; ogniuno porta qua il capuzo de prete et in li habiti se vede pur qualche reformatione. Ogni dì questa terra se fa più bella, tutto è fabricato andare a S<sup>ta</sup> Maria del populo venendo per la strada che vene alla casa del nostro card<sup>le</sup>, poi alla via dove è la casa di mes<sup>r</sup> Aug<sup>no</sup> Ghisi se sono fatte de brave case, mons<sup>r</sup> di S. Zorzo gli fa un bellis<sup>o</sup> palazzo; mes<sup>r</sup> Giuliano Gallo, mes<sup>r</sup> Paulo suo fratello et mes<sup>r</sup> Paulo Biondo vostro compatre se racco<sup>no</sup> a V. S. Ill<sup>ma</sup>. Rome XIII<sup>III</sup> ianuarij 1517.

[Orig. Gonzaga Archives, Mantua.]

#### 7. POPE LEO X. TO KING FRANCIS I. OF FRANCE.‡

1517, August. 3, Rom.

Leo X. recommends for a canonry at Paris: Joannes Cunsel unus ex iis pueris cantoribus, quos clar. mem. Aloisius rex pre-

\* This statement enables us to date this document; Morone was, in act, Protector of the "Oratory of Divine Love" from 1553-1558; see \*Register of the "Protettori" in the Archives of San Girolamo della Carità, Rome.

† See *supra*, pp. 128, 412.

‡ See *supra*, p. 145.

decessor tuus superioribus annis ad nos misit. The same is : et sua arte, in qua multum quotidie proficit, et grato in nos servitio dignus commendatione et premio.

Dat. Romae, 3. aug. 1517, p. n. a. 5°.

[Orig. National Archives, Paris, L. 357.]

# 8. THE SAFE-CONDUCT FROM POPE LEO X. TO JOHANN HEITMERS.\*

1517, November 30, Rom.

Leo Papa X. universis et singulis patriarchis, archiepiscopis, episcopis ac quibuscunque in dignitate ecclesiastica constitutis, presbyteris et clericis nec non ducibus, principibus, baronibus, comitibus, nobilibus, officialibus, communitatibus, hominibus et particularibus personis inclytarum nationum Germaniae, Daciae, Sueciae, Norwegiae et Gothiae, ad quas praesentes pervenerint, salutem et apostolicam benedictionem. Rempubicam litterariam diu antea periclitantem et pene intermortuam, a quibusdam vero annis citra reviviscentem volentes Deo propitio fovere, ut non modo praesentibus verum et posteris litterarum specimina et ornamenta conserventur atque amplificentur indeque studiosorum animi ad praeclara ingenii monumenta inflammentur, duximus quosque illustrissimos libros ac probatissimos utriusque linguae auctores undique conquirendos esse, ut in lucem editi studiosis ipsis commodo et splendori sint. Certiores itaque facti, quam plurimos vetustissimos libros in diversis locis provinciarum et regnorum praedictorum non sine ingenti rei litterariae iniuria occultatos esse eosdemque a studiosis omnibus desiderari, idcirco destinamus illuc inpraesentiarum dilectum filium Iohannem Heytmers de Zonuwen,† clericum Leodiensem commissarium nostrum, ut bibliothecas omnes dictarum provinciarum et regnorum perlustret, librosque huiusmodi omni quidem studio et diligentia conquirat et illos vel eorum exempla ad nos transportari faciat. Quare devotionem vestram et inprimis charissimum in Christo filium nostrum Maximilianum Romanorum electum

\* See *supra*, p. 267.

† Zonhoven, in the Belgian province of Limburg.

Imperatorem semper Augustum paterna hortamur charitate et maiori quo possumus studio et affectu requirimus, ut pro nostra et huius sanctae Sedis reverentia atque virtutis et doctrinae intuitu velit dictum Iohannem commissarium nostrum benigne recipere sinceraque in Domino charitate tractare ac permittere, ut quascunque bibliothecas ingredi possit; eidem, si ei videbitur, de opportunis salvis conductibus providere; demumque in exsequenda huiusmodi commissione nostra circa tam laudabile opus ita favere atque adesse, ut, quod nos de re litteraria ac commodo et ornamento studiosorum omnium mente concepimus, idipsum auctore Domino perficere valeamus. Offerentes nos ipsos quodcumque [sic] paratos ipsorum commodis, quantum cum Deo possumus, privilegiaque, indulgentias et alias ingentes gratias concessuros, prout nonnullis aliis tali causa moti sponte et liberaliter iam concessimus. Detentoribus autem et occupatoribus huiusmodi librorum et ad nos et dictam Sedem illos mittere indebite recusantibus atque scientibus detentores et occupatores huiusmodi et non revelantibus sub excommunicationis poena latae sententiae, quam ferimus in his scriptis et a qua nisi per nos quemvis absolvi posse volumus, districte praecipientes mandamus, quatenus visis praesentibus dictos libros vel exhibeant vel manifestent, ut censuras et poenas praedictas effugiant ac de obedientia et promptitudine sua a nobis et dicta Sede atque ab omnibus litterarum studiosis merito commendari et ab Deo bonorum omnium remuneratore immortale praemium sperare et consequi possent. Et ut facilius et citius dictus Iohannes commissarius noster praemissa exsequi valeat, damus per praesentes ei facultatem substituendi unum vel plures ad praemissa et quodlibet praemissorum cum pari aut limitata potestate illosque revocandi et ab eisdem rationem gestorum et administratorum exigendi et cogendi, super quibus plenam ei harum serie concedimus facultatem et potestatem. Datum Romae apud S. Petrum sub annulo piscatoris die ultima novembris MDXVII, pontificatus nostri anno quinto.

Sic signatum Iacobus Sadoletus.

Iohannes Heytmers commissarius pontificius harum litterarum vi communicat aliis litteris huiusmodi potestatem Iohannem [sic] Eydem priorem et pastorem in monasterio Helmershausen ordinis S. Benedicti, ut omnes per Saxoniam, novam et veterem Marchiam,



Hassiam vicinasque circumquaque ditiones bibliothecas publicas privatasque, omnes etiam cathedralium ecclesiarum, monasteriorum et collegiorum inspiciat, bonos auctores conquirat etc. Litterae datae sunt in monasterio Corbeiensi dioecesis Paderbornensis a. 1519, 30 martii.

[Cop. ex archivo Erfordensi a. 1677 descripsit A. Overham.  
Coll. III,\* Library, Wolfenbüttel.]

9. ANTONIO DE BEATIS TO THE MARCHIONESS ISABELLA OF  
MANTUA.†

1518, Mai 1, Rom.

. . . Intorno la Magliana se son fatte di bellissime cacie et con gran piacere di sua S<sup>ta</sup> che in vero el sig<sup>re</sup> † ha ultra quantità de cani et tele cinque monterì excellentissimi, a li quali el Papa prima che retornasse da la Magliana fe donare xxv duc<sup>ti</sup> doro per uno et un confessionale, et tra li altre fere§ che morsero in la dita Magliana ce ammazaro un cervo grossissimo serrato in le tele in pochissimo loco, dove el Papa intrò ad piede con lo speto a la mano et in laltra lo occhiale. . . .

[Orig. Gonzaga Archives, Mantua.]

10. POPE LEO X. TO LORENZO DE' MEDICI, DUKE OF URBINO.||

1518, Maii 28, Rom.

Duci Urbini de promotione electi Metensis. Ex nobilitatis tue litteris quas ad nos de honore di. fi. Io. electi Metensis misisti cognovimus et tuam etiam quidem, sed illius christianissimi et nobis huicque sancte sedi omnibus necessitudinum vinculis coniunctissimi Regis summam voluntatem, ut eum ipsum Io.

\* Communicated by the kindness of my deceased master and friend, Prof. Floss of Bonn.

† See *supra*, p. 162.

‡ Card. Luigi d'Aragona, whose villa, "Decima," was there.

§ MS., sere.

|| See *supra*, p. 458.

ad amplissimum ordinem cardinalatus advocaremus, tantumque honorem quo nullus a nobis tribui maior potest in homine illo et nobilitate et virtute eximia predito collocaremus. Quod etsi arduum ac difficile hoc tempore nobis videbatur propter tibi non ignotam in eo ordine patrum multitudinem, cui ampliorem numerum adiicere multo honestius erat ut recusaretur, quam ut per nos a sacro collegio peteretur, tamen nostra constans et perpetua voluntas isti clarissimo regi in omnibus quoad licitum sit gratificandi eiusque desyderia ceteris rationibus omnibus anteponendi fecit, ut omni auctoritate ac studio nostro hanc rem in secreto nostro consistorio et proponeremus et venerabilium fratrum nostrorum cum voluntate obtineremus. In quo cum nobis et nostre orationi ipsius Io. electi familie splendor generisque nobilitas longa serie a Lotharingie ducibus alte repetita, eiusdemque et fratris ipsius nobilis viri Antonii virtus fuit adiumento, tum vero, ut de voluntate ac precibus carissimi in Christo filii nostri F[rancisci] hoc a nobis magnopere postulantis fides venerabilibus fratribus nostris per nos est facta, sine ulla ulterius difficultate et mora et nobis presentibus et isti regi absenti a cunctis facile et libenter assensum est. Itaque eum hodie in eodem consistorio Deo auctore cardinalem pronuntiavimus. Quod statim voluimus nostris litteris nobilitati tue significare ut cognoscere posses id quod tamen multo antea cognovisti, nihil esse tam arduum neque tam difficile, quod illius amicissimi regis causa nobis non planum et facile videatur. Itaque in iis que illi grata sunt aut etiam erunt, nec amoris nostro modum nec liberalitati sumus posaturi nec vero dubitamus, quin in eadem ille erga nos et hanc sanctam sedem futurus sit voluntate; postulat hoc animi, postulat honoris ipsius amplitudo, in altero ut nobis mutua benevolentia respondeat, in altero ut sibi glorieque sue nihil magis convenire arbitretur quam sedis apostolice dignitatem amplam atque honestam velle et ut ita sit omni opera curare; sed de his erunt partes tue reducere ei in memoriam quam simus illius nomini et honori dediti. Nos insignia huius summi honoris quo predictum electum Metensem affecimus ad te missuri sumus, ut per te regi assignentur, et de eius auctoritate honestiori iam et clariori vertici ipsius Metensis imponantur. Tua vero nobilitas diligenter ac celeriter quas ad ipsum regem quasque ad dilectum iam filium nostrum

Io. cardinalem Metensem litteras scribimus curabit reddendas.  
Datum Rome 28 maii 1518 anno sexto.

[Sec. Arch. of the Vatican, Arm. 44, tom. 5, f. 167<sup>b</sup>-168.]

II. POPE LEO X. TO THE DOMINICAN FRANCESCO DA  
FERRARA.\*

1518, Junii 24, Rom.

Sane non absque animi nostri displicentia accepimus, quod nonnullae ex monialibus sub cura et secundum instituta fratrum praedicat. congregat<sup>is</sup> Lombardiae degentibus obedientiae iussum detractantes propria temeritate, aliae vero pretextu indultorum apostolicorum ad falsi suggestionem concessorum ex monasteriis, in quibus professionem emisierunt regularem, ad alia etiam non regularia loca se transferre seu verius apostatare presumpserunt, hactenus et in dies presumunt in animarum suarum periculum et monasteriorum predictorum detrimentum. He ought, on the other hand, to interfere. Dat. Romae 1518 junii 24, p. n. a. 6°.

Adresse: Francisco de Ferrara vicario generali ord. praedic. congregat. Lombardiae.

[Orig. State Archives, Milan, Autogr. III.]

12. BALDASSARE CASTIGLIONE TO THE MARQUIS OF MANTUA.†

1519, August. 17, Rom.

The Pope will postpone his journey from Rome especially on account of the expected death of Cardinal Luigi de' Rossi, el quale a questhora sta in transito. . . . El principio del suo male è stato gotta ne anchor troppo acerba et egli sopragionto un poco di febre con flusso e debilità di stomacho che in un tratto gli ha levato tutta la vertu.‡ Alchuni dicono che è stato veneno, ma io non lo credo e più presto estimo che li medici non intendendo la sua infirmità l'habbino ammazato come fanno anchor molti altri. . . .

[Orig. Gonzaga Archives, Mantua.]

\* See *supra* p. 455.

† See *supra*, p. 110.

‡ =virtù.

## 13. BALDASSARE CASTIGLIONE TO THE MARQUIS OF MANTUA.\*

1519, August. 19, Rom.

. . . Questa mattina circa alle hore XIII el card. de Rossi è passato all' altra vita ; una sua buona abbatia che è in Flandra estimasi chel card. Salviati l' haverà ; un altro assai buon beneficio che credo sia in Savoya haverà monsig. de Medici. El Papa demonstra grandissimo despiacere et ha pianto e piange e dice pubblicamente che la morte del fratello e quella del nepote non li dolsero più di quello che se habbi fatto questa. . . .

[Orig. Gonzaga Archives, Mantua.]

## 14. BALDASSARE CASTIGLIONE TO THE MARQUIS OF MANTUA.†

1519, August. 27, Rom.

A questi dì essendo morto monsig. rev<sup>mo</sup> de Rossi N. S. se ne ha preso grandissimo fastidio per il quale S. S<sup>ta</sup> parve che se alterasse un poco di doglia di testa e turbatione di stomacho et ad alchuni medici parve che un giorno non fosse senza febre, pur el dì drieto non fu niente. . . .

[Orig. Gonzaga Archives, Mantua.]

## 15. ANGELO GERMANELLO TO THE MARCHIONESS ISABELLA OF MANTUA.‡

1520, Februar. 19, Rom.

. . . In Roma per adesso non se intende altro de novo, omneuno attende ad le feste ; la zobia grassa fo facta la festa de agone et fo uno bellissimo spectaculo ; se armarono tucte le arti con el populo de Roma et se partectero de Capitolio con undeci carri triumphali con varie insigne tucti in ordinanza ; el primo carro havea lo insigne de una Italia, da poi con intervallo de gente armate li subseguiva el carro con la imagine della dea Isis, dea de la terra in colosso facta ad similitudine de uno simulacro

\* See *supra*, p. 110.† See *supra*, p. 110.‡ See *supra*, p. 175.



de dicta dea, che ha el papa in la sua logia antiquiss<sup>o</sup> et bello ; da poi era el carro de Neptuno innudo con el tridente in colosso ; el quarto era uno Herculi, che duceva molti homini catenati ; el quinto era uno Atlante con la sphaera in le spalle ; el sexto era Eulo, dio de li venti, el septimo Vulgano con li sui ministri Piragmon, Brontes et Steropes ; l'uctava era el Venere con una Roma de sopra ; el nono era uno Alexandro magno ad cavallo in lo suo bucefalo in figura de uno gran colosso ; el decimo era uno mondo con una vipera de sopra, lo undecimo una lupa, el XII et XIII in altre figure tucti intervallati luno dal altro et in colossi ; da poi subseguivano gente armate et a piede et ad cavallo con li ioculatori secundo se usava in li triumphi antiqui. Subseguivano circa cento pucti benissimo vestiti ad l' antiqua et velleribus niveis et festa fronde revincti, tucti pieni de perle et de altre cose pretiose ad cavallo in bellissimo cavalli falarati ad l' antiqua et coperti de pelli de lupo, cervieri la groppa de dicti cavalli per la maior parte et de altre bellissime coperte et omneuno havevano li staffieri ad la sua livrea et erano menati ad mano doi camelli vivi juvenecti li quali novamente son stati donati al papa et molti belli cavalli et subseguivano molti altri adolescenti ad cavallo in mirabili cavalli et procedevano molti cavalli bardati. Li ultimi erano quattro cavalli bardati con barde et sopraveste tucte de broccato ; da poi subseguiva el figliolo del s<sup>r</sup> Joanzorzo Cesarino et lui et tucto el cavallo con sopraveste de broccato et portava lo stendardo de lo populo Romano et el senatore con uno gran manto de broccato et con lu capuccio in testa pur de broccato et li andavano ad lato li conservatori pur vestiti de broccato et li precedevano molti cavalli coperti con molti soni de tamburi, trombete et altri instrumenti et andarono tucti de directo dal Capitolio al castello dove era el papa et passarono in borgo per fine ad la piazza de san Piero et retornaro in agone molto tardo et fo uno nobiliss<sup>o</sup> spectaculo de una gran gente et una gran pompa et referto de molto più cose che io non scrivo. El card<sup>le</sup> de san Vitale, el quale ha la sua casa che responde in agone, fece quel dì uno belliss<sup>o</sup> et nobile pasto, dove intervennero vinti cardinali per posser da poi veder la festa, ma poco ne gustarono, quando arrivò in agone era iam nocte. Hoie è stata facta la caccia de doi thori in Capitolio, uno de li thori ha ammazati doi homini ; domane se fa la festa de Testaccio. Se io ho fastidita la V. Ex<sup>ia</sup> con queste cose li scrivo ultimo quella

se degnarà admetterne la scusa et ascriverlo al tempo per essere de carnevale.

Rome XIX feb<sup>ii</sup> MDXX.

[Orig. Gonzaga Archives, Mantua.]

16. ANGELO GERMANELLO TO THE MARQUIS OF MANTUA.\*

1520, Mart. 17, Rom.

Post scripta è occorso che havendo el papa chiamato Joanpaulo Baglione in Roma et essendo venuto assecurato de lo arcivescuvo Ursino et molti altri s<sup>ri</sup> pur Ursini andando dal papa, el quale se ritrovava in castello, per prestarli obedientia fo retenuto dal governatore de Roma et el barisello a conducto de sopra in castello et clauso in certe stantie; el papa sta da basso; lu dicto arcivescuvo et li altri Ursini molto se affatigano per cavarlo; el papa domanda securtà de sexanta milia ducati de bene vivendo; tucta via vadono preparando dicte securtà; miser Angelo da Cese la ha facta per uno per XX milia ducati et molti altri per altre summe et tucti sonno officiali perchè el papa ricerca voler la securtà de tal qualità. . . . Rome XVII marcij MDXX.

[Orig. Gonzaga Archives, Mantua.]

17. ANGELO GERMANELLO TO THE MARCHIONESS  
ISABELLA OF MANTUA.†

1520, April 11, Rom.

Altro per adesso non occorre se non visitare humilm<sup>te</sup> la V. Ex<sup>ia</sup> con le presenti et significarli come hoie in Roma sonno stati doi spectaculi, uno li funerali de Augustino Ghisci, el quale morete heri matina et hoie è stato sepulto al Populo accompagnato da la famiglia del papa et de tucti card<sup>li</sup> et da octo regule overo ordini de frati con circa doicento cinquanta torce portate da facchini et li frati omneuno hebe el suo ceriolo et ci era anchora circa octanta preti seculari et cento vestiti de negro, benchè dicono che li vestiti sonno cento et vinti, et ci erano anchora molti bactuti et altre brigate dove erano circa XXXVI vescovi.

\* See *supra*, p. 6.

† See *supra*, pp. 9, 120.

È stato sepolto in la sua cappella, la qual tucta via faceva fare et ia ei haveva spesi più de quattordeci milia ducati. Ha lapsati heredi doi soi figlioli maschi et dotate doi altre figliole femine, li quali haveva suscepti de una sua concubina et da poi la ha sposata, et li lassate sub protectione del papa et de mes<sup>r</sup> Angelo da Cese, et secundo se dice ha lassata robba per seicento milia ducati tra el trafico de lo alume et le altre robbe. Lo altro spectaculo è stata la intrata che ha facta in Roma don Joanni Emanuele oratore de re de Romani, el quale è intrato in Roma accompagnato secundo el solito de li altri ambasciatori, ma de li sui ha poca brigata et male in ordine et è intrato senza cariagi et è alloggiato in la cancellaria in casa del card<sup>le</sup> de Medici. Venerdì serà concistorio publico et lunedì se dice che el papa andarà ad la Magliana dove starà alcuni dì. Venerdì sancto de nocte morete lo excell<sup>mo</sup> pictor Raphael da Urbino. De Joanpaulo Baglione se tene comunemente che el papa li habia facta tagliare la testa, benchè non se habia per certo. . . . Rome XI aprilis 1520.

[Orig. Gonzaga Archives, Mantua.]

18. FABRIZIO PELLEGRINO TO THE MARQUIS OF MANTUA.\*

1521, Januar. 15, Rom.

. . . Martin Luther damnato per heretico dicono havere voluto intervenire alla dieta per giustificare le opinione sue spincto dal duca di Saxonia et complici suoi; ma Cesare non lha comportato, anzi che ha cacciato el nuntio del p<sup>to</sup> duca con gran minaccie; et anchora ce aviso che detto Martino con sue predicatione ha subvertiti certi populi et cità de Saxonia, di modo che hanno abrusati tutti li libri et corpi di ragione cano<sup>ca</sup> et levati da la obedientia de la Chiesa Romana. . . .

[Orig. Gonzaga Archives, Mantua.]

19. BALDASSARE CASTIGLIONE TO THE MARQUIS OF MANTUA.†

1521, Juli 6, Rom.

. . . La nova del capitaniato di V. E. è tale che darà da ragionare ancor un pezzo per Roma: per satisfattione di quella

\* See *supra*, p. 22.

† See *supra*, p. 45.

gli dico che non solamente tutta la corte, ma tutta questa città ha fatto dimonstrazione di haverne grandissima contentezza e prelati e cardinali, Ursini e Colonesi e d'ogni sorte homini.

[Orig. Gonzaga Archives, Mantua.]

20. BALDASSARE CASTIGLIONE TO THE MARQUIS OF MANTUA.\*

1521, August. 23, Rom.

. . . Il Papa sta de bonissimo animo et se ripromette certa victoria misurando le forze del suo exercito con quelle dello inimico. N. S. non ha maggior piacere che intendere nova del campo e le grande e le piccole. The Marquis must, therefore, write often. The Pope: spera finirla (the war) presto e tiene per certo che'l re de Anglittera debbe essere seco e con Cesare et ha ancora optima opinione che li Sig. Venetiani non debbino essere troppo gagliardi amici de Francesi. N. S. questa mattina dopo la messa in castello benedì le bandere et il bastone del capitaniato de la chiesa che se hanno da mandare a V. Ex. M. Jacomo da Gambara li porterà a quella: sono bellissime et N. S. spera che debbiano essere vitoriose. . . .

[Orig. Gonzaga Archives, Mantua.]

21. POPE LEO X. TO CARDINAL GIULIO DE' MEDICI.†

1521, September 30, Rom.

Leo X. . . . dilecto filio Julio tit. s<sup>ti</sup> Laurentii in Damaso presbytero card<sup>li</sup> s<sup>te</sup> Rom. Ecclesie vicecancellario in civitate nostra Bononie ac exarchatu Ravenne, Tuscia et Italia et ad quecunque ipsius Italie et extra eam ad que forsan te declinare contigerit loca nostro et apostolice Sedis legato salutem. Cum nuper quod non sine animi nostri molestia referre cogimur sperantibus nobis, quod christiani reges ac principes mutua inter se concordia consentientes et indutias alias per nos indictas ac per eos acceptatas constanter ac fideliter servantes contra perfidos Turchas Hungarie regnum invadere parantes arma capere ac non solum dictum regnum ab imminente periculo tutari ac defendere, sed ipsos etiam Turchas debellare ac provincias et

\* See *supra*, p. 49.

† See *supra*, p. 52.



regna tamdiu per eos detenta et occupata a tam dira et crudeli servitute vindicare deberent et circa id car<sup>mus</sup> in Christo filius noster Carolus Roman. et Hispaniarum rex Cath<sup>cus</sup> in imperatorem electus ac nonnulli alii reges et principes una nobiscum intenti essent unusque nostris adeo piis ac promptis desideriis omnino contrarius videlicet Francorum rex totius christiane reipublice commodis privatam suam ambitionem preferens, dictas indutias temere violare ac dictum Carolum in imp<sup>rem</sup> electum nichil tale suspicantem regno suo Navarre potius insidiis ac proditione quam vi bellica et aperto Marte spoliare presumpsisset, quod tamen non multo post magna suorum amissione ac strage relinquere coactus fuit, similibusque insidiis civitatem nostram Regii per iniquitatis filium Thomam Deloscuto occupare nixus fuisset, praefatus Carolus in Imperatorem electus memor se s<sup>tae</sup> Rom. Ecclesiae advocatum esse et ad ipsum praeter ceteros omnes pertinere, ipsam ab omnibus injuriis defendere et contra eam aliquid moliri ausos ulcisci, nostra magis quam propria sua injuria motus tam novam et inauditam temeritatem et insolentiam ulcisci statuit et propterea equestres ac pedestres copias fere omnes quas pro custodia et defensione regni sui Siciliae citra Pharum habebat, nobis concessit, ut illis militaribus copiis nostris conjunctis Parmam et Placentiam civitates nostras, quas a dicto rege occupari ac detineri publice pacis et quietis causa per aliquot annos toleravimus, tandem recuperare possemus. Postquam igitur valido et copioso comparato exercitu injurias per dictum Francorum regem nobis illatas, ne alii eius exemplo similia tentare praesumant, debite ulcisci ac dictas civitates et alia loca, castra et oppida ad nos et dictam Roman. Ecclesiam pertinentia recuperare statuimus ac deliberavimus, cogitantibus nobis ydoneum aliquem eligere, cui tantarum rerum summam tuto credere possemus, nemo circumspectione tua usu rerum prudentia ingenii dexteritate ac fide aptior occurrit, cum praesertim memores simus, ipsam circumspectionem tuam tot ac tam arduis curis et legationibus sibi per nos et hanc sanctam sedem commissis ac demandatis ita semper se in omnibus gessisse, ut eximiae virtuti parem felicitatem in ea conjuncta[m] esse cognoverimus nec sinistri aliquid unquam ex his audiverimus, quae ipsius ductu et auspicio gereretur, ac propterea nobis promittere possimus, quod eadem circumspectio tua in hoc tantae molis ac magni-

tudinis negotio tractando et ad finem optatum perducendo spei, quam de singulari et eximia ipsius virtute concepimus, divina favente clementia respondebit: te igitur ad omnipotentis Dei laudem christianaque fidei exaltationem ejusque hostium ac rebellium confusionem et depressionem nostri ac dicti Caroli in imperatorem electi exercituum invicem unitorum nostro et dictae Rom. Ecclesiae nominibus de fratrum nostrorum consilio usque ad beneplacitum nostrum legatum de latere auctoritate apostolica cum eisdem facultatibus et concessionibus in omnibus et per omnia, quas in litteris et legatione Bononien. tibi concessimus, tenore praesentium constituimus creamus et deputamus. Quocirca eidem circumspeditioni tuae per praesentes mandamus, ut ad dictos exercitus te conferas et, quantum coelestis gratiae infusio tibi subministrabit, omnipotentis Dei, qui justas causas foventibus semper propitius adest, prospero auxilio ac eorundem exercituum valido robore fretus prudentique tuo consilio utens ita agas ordines atque disponas omnia et singula, quae ad consequendae victoriae effectum cognoveris expedire; non dubitamus enim quin, gressus tuos domino dirigente, sanctissimum hoc negotium, ad quod a nobis et dicta sede missus ac destinatus, prosperum ac felicem sortiatur exitum. Et ut nobis ac desideriiis nostris plenius satisfacere valeas, dilectis filiis dictorum exercituum ad nostra et dictae sedis stipendia militantium capitaneo gubernatori ac aliis armorum conductoribus tam in castris militaribus quam in civitatibus terris et locis nobis mediate vel immediate subjectis nostro nomine et auctoritate praecipendi et ordinandi necnon contradictores quoslibet et rebelles per quaecunque juris opportuna remedia compescendi licentiam et facultatem concedimus. Non obstantibus. . . .

Dat. Romae etc. [sic] anno etc. [sic] mill<sup>mo</sup> quingent<sup>mo</sup> vigesimo-primo, pridie kal. octobris, pontificatus nostri anno nono.

D. de Comitibus.

Collat. : Hip. de Cesis.

[Sec. Arch. of the Vatican, Regest. Vat. 1202, f. 233.]

## 22. THE "LEONINE LETTERS" OF P. BEMBO.

Among the sources for the history of Leo X., the numerous Latin letters of the private secretary P. Bembo, written during his

term of office, hold a foremost place. They have not lost in importance since access was given to the Secret Archives of the Vatican. The latter contain such a very incomplete collection of the Pope's letters, that it must be considered fortunate for our historical knowledge that such a famous master of style as Bembo should have taken with him a portion of the Papal Registers, and published it subsequently, under Paul III., at Venice,\* 1535-1536: "Libri sexdecim epistolarum Leonis X., P.M. nomine scriptarum" (see our remarks, *supra*, p. 193 *seq.*; also Kalkoff, *Forschungen*, 15). The question, whether Bembo, in this edition, had introduced alterations, had occupied at an early date no less a scholar than Raynaldus. In his "Annales," 1513, n. 100, he remarks: "Excusae typis ipsae litterae a Petro Bembo fuere inter alias quas Leonis nomine, cui a secretis erat, composuit; sed immutatis paululum consuetis Romanae curiae formulis, quas latinae linguae nitori elegantiaeque, quam consecrabatur, consentire non putabat: quo studio dum scripta perpoliebat Tullianosque flosculos avidius colligebat, incautus etiam gentilitiarum vocum putores aliquos inseruit, a quibus styli Romanae curiae sanctitas penitus abhorret: qua de re monitum lectorem volumus ad retundenda maledicentiae tela, quae aliqui captata ex huiusmodi oculis occasione iaculari possunt: quapropter nos in literis, quas ex Bembo decerpimus, consuetam pontificalis curiae formulam, cum Pontifex loquens inducitur, restituisse, cum ea verborum formula fuissent conceptae atque a Bembo elegantiarum latinarum cupidissimo, dum typis excudebat, immutatae."

This, as we shall see, most pertinent observation has, unfortunately, passed unnoticed, although Ranke has adopted it in his "Zur Kritik," 87\*-88\*. Not only heated adversaries of the Renaissance such as Gaume, but even such a scientific inquirer as Professor Piper of Berlin, in his "Mythologie der christl. Kunst" (I., 286), has, like many others, taken the classical phraseology in Bembo's Leonine Letters as conclusive evidence of the inroads made by paganism in the Curia of Leo X.; even Sabbadini still holds this view (*Ciceronianismo*, 52). And yet the importance of the question is not confined merely to the authenticity of these

\* This edition is the most correct; the better-known edition of Basle, 1539, already showed certain variations in the text, which were not, however, of great importance.



letters ; it is of incomparably greater importance as regards their use as sources of history. Ranke (*loc. cit.*) has not gone into this question. The doubts suggested by this passage in his writings led, however, F. Sydow to examine the whole matter in the "Rostocker Dissertation" for 1893. The result arrived at by Sydow was as follows : "The letters in form and substance are genuine, and may be used as historical sources free from suspicion" (p. 43). His thesis is right as regards his first conclusion, wrong as regards his second. Sydow examined the contents of fifty letters : since in them he came upon no error in fact, he concluded "that Bembo, if the letters were revised, had revised them, perhaps from a journal, but in any case with a sound memory for facts" (p. 41). He inquires into the evidence for the statement that Bembo had given the letters their present turn, not from the beginning, but at some later date. In support of this he finds only "the solitary assertion of Raynaldus," and inveighs against the latter, for restoring the original form of the letters, "a Bembo elegantiarum latinarum cupidissimo, dum typis excudebat, immutatae," in the following terms : "Was this also done from the Diaries? For the original letters were scattered all over the world. We will assume that he restored them from the Diaries in the Papal Archives. Leo, as Bembo, who ought to have known, tells us, employed on the Archives thirty clerks and two private secretaries (præfat. epist. Leonis X.). He insisted on fine elegant Latin ; therefore he secured as private secretaries two of the best neolatinists of the day. But in this case it is absurd to challenge the authenticity of the letters on the ground that the Curial letters were always written in bad Latin, and that these are written in good. That is exactly, as it seems to me, what calls for proof. A man of taste like Leo wished his private correspondence to be composed in the best possible style ; therefore he employed Bembo. Read Bembo's own contemporary private letters ; they display the same finish, the same clearness, the same substitution of classical phrases for the phraseology of the Church. Bembo, therefore, if he revised the letters, at a later date, with a view to their publication, must have been at the trouble of adapting his polished Latinity to the official forms of the Curia, and Leo must have appointed the best Latinist of his day as secretary in order that the latter might unlearn his Latin ! Further, granted that



Raynaldus did not make a deliberately false statement, yet he was liable to make mistakes. Bembo could only have restored the original form from Diaries. These were written by the clerks in bad Latin. Now, if I assert the direct contrary to Raynaldus, I have all the more right to do so. If I say that all letters were first written by clerks, and that the most important private letters, which had the classical style required by Leo, were afterwards rewritten by Bembo and Sadoletto, and then signed and sealed by the Pope—am I not making an assertion which is just as well grounded as the other? If Bembo, when secretary, wrote no letters, how came it, as all his biographers relate, that he was overworked in Leo's service? But if he did write letters, most certainly he wrote them in good Latin; for that purpose he was made secretary; and, moreover, bad Latin he could not have written. We may add another consideration. What does Bembo say in his preface? 'This shall serve as a reminder to Paul III.'; 'Thus did we write in the Chancery of Leo X.'; 'Emulate him'; 'I threw some letters, at random, in those days, into my despatch boxes; they are historical, of interest to us all, and a sample of composition for your clerks and secretaries.' There would have been no point in writing in this way to Paul III. if the letters had been issued in bad Latin under Leo X." (pp. 42-43). Thus far, Sydow. The latter, however, has not made sufficient use of the literature touching this subject. From Mazzuchelli, whom he quotes (p. 5), with just commendation, he might have seen that the Ambrosian Library in Milan possesses a Codex (marked P. 130) of high importance for his work. Hergenröther's "Regesta," as well as an observation of Cian in the *Giorn. d. lett. Ital.*, XI., 1887, 238, would have called his attention to another not less important—the Vatican Codex, 3364. It is still more difficult to understand why he never even inquired whether some of the original letters, scattered all over the world, were not still in existence. Instead of that he makes use of the strange hypothesis of "Diaries" in the Papal Archives, from which alone Bembo could have restored the original form.

With the help of the original letters and the two manuscripts, the Vatican and the Ambrosian, the question at issue can be thoroughly cleared up. Mazzuchelli (*Scrittori*, II., 2, 765) had already quoted the Cod. Vat. 3364; but he could hardly have

investigated it personally, otherwise its great importance would not have escaped him. Nolhac (*Bibl. de Fulvio Orsini*) is mistaken in his description of the manuscript, whereon Cian (*loc. cit.*) remarks correctly that it certainly does not contain the minutes of the letters. Hergenröther in his "Regesta" quotes the Cod. Vat. repeatedly, noticing also occasional variations (*e.g.* in Regest., n. 2833), but he does not get nearer to the value of the manuscript. This consists in the numerous corrections of the letters which have been made in this Codex. Closer inspection gives the surprising and interesting result that all these corrections were first made when the letters were being prepared for publication, and that much of the classical phraseology, which has been so severely censured in these Papal despatches, was introduced into the Vatican manuscript precisely at the later date when the latter were being got ready for the printers. In many passages a pagan expression has been substituted for one which had too Christian a sound. Thus:—

I. 5. Originally "quod avertat Deus"; this was first altered to "quod Deus Opt. max. prohibeat," then later to "quod Deus omen obruat," as it is printed.

I. 24. The inscription "monialibus murat. Florentiae" is altered to "sacris virginibus." Elsewhere also there are the same minor alterations.

II. 20. The original title, "Alberto ordinis b. Mariae Theuton. magno magistro," altered to "ordinis Marianor" (in the Venetian copy; societ. Mar.).

III. 21. "aura Zephyri coelestis" stands in place of "aura s. spiritus," which has been struck through. This has often been quoted as evidence of the paganized style of the Papal despatches.

III. 22. Instead of "ipsorum phano praefecti," originally "ecclesiae div. Andreae rectori."

V. 1. "cardinalium creationem" is changed into "comitia."

V. 19. "huius imperii" was originally "reipublicae christianae."

VI. 25. "Solymanum tyrannum" is changed into "regem."

A certainly trifling yet characteristic alteration is that of "fratrum nostrorum S. R. E. cardinalium" into "fratrum meorum E. R. cardinalium." The omission of "sanctus" also occurs elsewhere, *e.g.* X. 1.

IX. 4. "optimi catholicique principis" changed into "opt. prudentissimique."

X. 53. "nostrae custodiae" is changed into "praetorianorum militum" (in the Venetian text: praet. equitum).

XII. 24. "christiani nominis hostibus" is changed to "hostibus nostris."

XIV. 23. "Xisti card<sup>lis</sup> eius ecclesiae," changed into "phani."\* Nearly always the "pluralis maiest." is changed into the first person singular, so that instead of "nobis" we have "mihi," and s.f. Long titles are very often curtailed to the mere name, to which is added the chief official attribute; long sentences are given in a more concise form; some small sentences are wholly omitted. Lastly, the dates of the Christian calendar are always expressed in terms of the Roman. As regards the contents of the letters, no substantial alterations are made.

To what a great extent verbal variations have taken place in both the versions of the Cod. Vatic., and what a difference there is, although only verbally, between them and the originals, can be seen from the examples on pp. 488 and 489.

With the exception of some small variations, the second version of the Cod. Vat. agrees with the printed copy; but both versions show a marked divergency of expression from the original, with which they are yet in agreement as regards the substance. The same result is obtained from a comparison with other pieces, of which the original version has been preserved.† Now, if we open the Codex P. 130 of the Ambrosian Library, and compare the first letter to the Doge, of the 14th of March, 1513, with the three different recensions given on pp. 488-9, we see at once that the Cod. Ambros. agrees with the original version; it even offers some better readings, since a good many inaccuracies have found their way into Sanuto's transcript.‡

\* X. 44 and XI. 11: "phanum," on the other hand, is found in the first version. In the same way XII. 24, "a diis immortalibus"; and XIII. 32, "Deorum immortalium"; and VIII. 17, "deam." On the other hand, "Bern. S. Mariae in porticu diac. card." is altered to "Bern. Bibienae card."

† Cf. II. 1=Sanuto, XVI. 170-171 (error in date); III. 21=Sanuto, XVI. 479-481; V. 28=Sanuto, XVII. 307-308. Cf. also IX. 36 with the original in the State Archives, Modena. A comparison of X. 5 with Sanuto, XIX., 249-252 only shows slight variations.

‡ Cf. *supra*, p. 488 n.



## LEO X. TO THE DOGE

ORIGINAL DESPATCH, EDITED IN  
SANUTO XVI 50.<sup>1</sup>

Leo Papa X. Dilecte fili etc.<sup>2</sup>

Postquam<sup>3</sup> Deus<sup>4</sup> Maximus statuit felices recordationis Iulium secundum Romanum pontificem ex hoc laborioso vitae mortalis curriculo ad illam beatissimam piorum sedem et patriam atque ad se unde venerat revocare, ille autem rebus omnibus quae ad proxime obituros pertinent sancte compositis, ad extremum unctus de<sup>5</sup> vita placide constanterque decessisset, quod quidem die XXI februarii fuit, Nos, qui tunc cardinalem gerebamus, atque coeteri<sup>6</sup> ex eodem collegio fratres, cum eius funeri exequisque celebrandis statutum tempus dedissemus, Sancti Spiritus aura et nostri Salvatoris illuminatione praecibus omnibus invocata in unum convenimus conclavium, quae fecimus ut futurum pontificem de more crearem. Itaque, quemadmodum Illi placuit, qui Petrum elegit, ut Sui Vicarium in terris gereret, cuius deinceps munus<sup>7</sup> reliqui summi pontifices gesserunt,<sup>8</sup> omnium cardinalium vota, omnes ad unum sententiae, nos in eius locum die XI mensis martii elegerunt<sup>9</sup> et summum pontificem creaverunt. Quod nobilitati tuae significandum per nostras<sup>10</sup> litteras fuimus,<sup>11</sup> te atque rempublicam tuam magno amore complexi sumus, a paternae caritatis affectu atque officio<sup>12</sup> post haec<sup>13</sup> plane non discessuros, sed etiam, ut cogitares, pro tua in nos quidem adhuc omni tempore, in sedem autem apostolicam cum spe<sup>14</sup> alias tum vero proxime bene cognita illustri singularique pietate ac observantia, confidere nos te senatumque illum<sup>15</sup> tuum, qui gravissimum<sup>16</sup> semper est habitus, omnes vestros<sup>17</sup> cogitatus in Domini semita dirigentes, praeterita vestra laudabilia officia<sup>18</sup> atque studia etiam superatos<sup>19</sup> effecturosque quantum in vobis erit, ut et huius almae sedis reverentia dignitasque augeatur et fessi iam bellis omnium qui recte sentiunt animi respirare tandem et quietis ac securitatis tempora sperare atque aspicere possint, quod quid honestius quidve utilius<sup>20</sup> tentandum conandumque abste<sup>21</sup> suscipiatur, non facile reperies aut in quo plus a Deo gratia plus ab hominibus<sup>22</sup> commendationesque<sup>23</sup> promerere.<sup>24</sup>

Datum Romae<sup>25</sup> apud s. Petrum sub anulo piscatoris die 14 martii 1513, ante nostram<sup>26</sup> coronationem.

Petrus Bembus.<sup>26</sup>

(A tergo :) Dilecto filio nobili viro Leonardo Loredano duci Venetiarum.<sup>26</sup>

FIRST VERSION OF THE COD. VATIC.

Duci Venetiarum.

Cum Iulius secundus pontifex maximus quem quidem ex hac laboriosa hominum peregrinatione ad illam beatissimam piorum patriam coelum ad se unde venerat revocare Deus Opt. Max. constituerat rebus omnibus quae ad proxime obituros pertinent sancte compositis, ad extremum unctus, nono cal. mart. placide constanterque decessisset: ego, qui tum cardinalem gerebam caeterique ex eodem collegio fratres eius funeri more maiorum celebrando praestitutum tempus cum dedissemus, flantis de coelo favoris auram suppliciter precati quae coepta nostra cogitationesque secundaret, unum in locum in Vaticano convenimus conclavinque fecimus ut novum pontificem de more legeremus. Itaque quemadmodum illi placuit, qui Petrum legit, ut suum vicarium in terris gereret, cuius deinceps vicem reliqui summi pontifices gereremus, omnium cardinalium suffragia me in demortui locum ad diem quintum idus martias legerunt et summum pontificem creaverunt; quam quidem ego creationem meam tibi significare his litteris volui non solum ut scires me qui profecto quamdiu inter cardinales fui te remque publicam tuam magno amore sum complexus a paterni animi benevolentia atque officio posthac plane non discessurum, sed etiam ut cogitares pro tua in me certe adhuc quidem omni tempore, in rempublicam autem cum saepe alias tum vero proxime bene cognita illustri singularique pietate confidere nos te senatumque istum tuum, qui gravissimus semper est habitus, omnes vestras cogitationes pacis ad nomen signumque convertentes praeterita vestra laudabilia officia atque studia etiam superaturos effecturosque quantum in vobis erit ut huius reipublicae reverentia dignitasque augeatur et fessi iam bellis omnium qui recte sentiunt animi respirare et quietis ac securitatis tempora sperare atque aspirare aliquando tandem possint: quod quid honestius, quidve utilius abste tentandum conandumque suscipiatur non facile reperies aut in quo plus tibi a Deo gratiae, plus ab hominibus verae laudis atque gloriae parias.

Dat. prid. id. martias MDXIII ante coronat. Roma [sic].

<sup>1</sup> The various readings of the Cod. Ambros. are distinguished by the letter A.

<sup>2</sup> A: Duci Venetiarum.

<sup>3</sup> A: Posteaquam.

<sup>4</sup> A: Optimus Max.

<sup>5</sup> A: e.

<sup>6</sup> A: caeteri.

<sup>7</sup> A: vicem.

<sup>8</sup> A: gereremus.

<sup>9</sup> A: legerunt.

<sup>10</sup> Missing in A.

<sup>11</sup> duximus, non solum ut scires nos, qui profecto quamdiu inter cardinales fuimus.

<sup>12</sup> A: officio.

<sup>13</sup> A: hac.

<sup>14</sup> A: saepe.

<sup>15</sup> A: istum.

<sup>16</sup> A: gravissimus.

<sup>17</sup> A: nostros.

<sup>18</sup> A: officia.

<sup>19</sup> A: superaturos.

<sup>20</sup> In A., there follows: abs te.

<sup>21</sup> Missing in A.

<sup>22</sup> In A., there follows: laudis.

<sup>23</sup> A: commendationisque.

<sup>24</sup> A: promerere.

<sup>25</sup> Apud—piscatoris missing in A.

<sup>26</sup> Missing in A.



## L. LOREDANO (1513, MARTII 14).

## SECOND VERSION OF THE COD. VATIC.

Leonardo Lauredano duci Venetiarum.

Etsi non dubito quin ab oratore tuo, viro et prudente et diligente, ea libenter intellexeris, quae hic proxime acciderunt, tamen illa ipsa si meis etiam litteris ad te perferrentur, multo tibi iucundiora putavi fore. Nam cum Iulius secundus Romanus pontifex, quem quidem iam ad se revocare Deus Opt. Max. constituerat, rebus omnibus, quae ad brevi morituros pertinent, sancte compositis, ad extremum unctus nono cal. mart. de vita placide constanterque decessisset: ego, qui tum cardinalem gerebam, caeterique ex eodem collegio principes eius funeri celebrando praestitutum tempus cum dedissemus, flantis de coelo favoris auram suppliciter precati, quae coepta nostra cogitationesque secundaret, unum in locum in Vaticano convenimus, ut novum pontificem more maiorum legeremus. Itaque quemadmodum illi placuit, qui Petrum legit, ut suum vicarium in terris gereret, cuius deinceps munus reliqui summi pontifices gereremus, omnium cardinalium suffragia me in demortui locum ad diem quintum idus martias legerunt et summum pontificem creaverunt. Quae cum ita se habent, haec ad te scripsi, non solum ut scires me, qui profecto quamdiu inter cardinales fui, te remque istam publicam magno amore sum complexus, a paterni animi benevolentia atque officio posthac non discessurum, sed etiam ut cogitares, pro tua in me certe adhuc quidem omni tempore in rem Romanam autem cum saepe alias tum vero proxime bene cognita illustri singularique pietate me magnopere confidere, te senatumque istum tuum, qui gravissimus semper est habitus, omnes vestras cogitationes pacis ad nomen signumque convertentes praeterita vestra laudabilia officia atque studia etiam superaturos effecturosque quantum in vobis erit ut huius reipublicae dignitas maiestasque augeatur et fessi iam bellis omnium, qui recte sentiunt, animi respirare et quietis ac securitatis tempora sperare atque aspirare aliquando tandem possint: quod quid honestius quidve utilius abstinentandum conandumque suscipiatur non facile reperies aut in quo plus tibi a divina bonitate gratiae, plus ab hominibus verae laudis atque gloriae parias.

Datis prid. id. martias<sup>o</sup> MDXIII ante coronat.  
Roma [sic].

Text (I., 1) in essential agreement with the second version of the Cod. Vatic., but with the following variations: legato tuo, homine

atque ego

praestitutum lege; cum is wanting; instead of flantis—favoris: divinae mentis; instead of coepta: incoepta; instead of secundaret: proveheret ei placuit

sed etiam te certiolem facerem, magnam me iam spem recte atque cum dignitate rem Romanam administrandi in senatus tui, qui gravissimus semper est habitus, sapientia, consiliis, aequitate, quodque omnium est maximum, erga nos perveteri constantique amore posuisse. Datis etc. as in the second version of the Cod. Vatic.

On further comparison we arrive at the certainty that the Cod. Ambros. is the Register Book of the Papal Chancery. Thus, for example, the letter to P. Bembo of the 13th of April, 1513, printed by Sanuto XVI., 170-171, (Sanuto has sometimes misread or omitted a few words, *e.g.*, in the Cod. Ambros., after “tabelarium,” follows “quam magnis itineribus perferri volumus tibi que mandamus”) agrees with the Cod. Ambros., while the impression II. 1 runs quite differently, and also has a wrong date (V. Id. April = April 9). To show the characteristics of the Cod. Ambros., two more instructive comparisons shall be given :—

LETTER TO THE MARQUIS F. GONZAGA OF MANTUA, 30TH AUGUST 1514.

Cod. Ambros. P. 130.	Original, in the Gon- zaga Archives, Mantua.	First Version of the Cod. Vatic.	Second Version of the Cod. Vatic.
Marchioni Mantuæ. Quoniam eo cantore, qui gravi-ori voce in capella nostra apte utatur, egemus, nobilitatem tuam hortamur in domino, velis ad nos Michaellem Lucensem cantorem tuum mittere, erit id nobis admodum gratum teque ita facturum pro tua in nos reverentia proque nostra in te paterna caritate plane confidimus. Dat. Romæ 30 augusti 1514 anno secundo.	Dilecte fili sal. et apost. benedict. Quoniam cantore qui graviori voce in capella nostra apte utatur egemus, nobilitatem tuam hortamur in Domino velis ad nos Michaellem Lucensem cantorem tuum mittere tamdiu apud nos futurum quoad alium idoneum ad eam rem perquiramus : erit id nobis admodum gratum teque ita facturum pro tua in nos reverentia proque nostra in te paterna charitate plane confidimus. Datum Romæ apud S. Petrum sub annulo piscat. die 30 aug. 1514 pont. n. anno secundo. P. Bembus.	Cum ad sacra conficienda preces-que divinas celebrandas cantore mihi opus sit qui graviori voce concinat abste velim si tibi incommodum non est ut ad me Michaellem Lucensem cantorem tuum mittas ut eo nostris in sacris atque templo quod est omnium celeberrimum atque sanctissimum communemque totius orbis terrarum pietatem atque lætiti- am continet uti possim. Dat. tertio cal. aug. an. sec. Romæ.	Quoniam ad sacra facienda preces-que divinas celebrandas cantore mihi opus est qui graviori voce concinat, velim si tibi incommodum non est ut ad me Michaellem Lucensem cantorem tuum mittas ut eo nostris in sacris atque templo quod est omnium celeberrimum atque sanctissimum communemque totius orbis terrarum pietatem et lætiti- am continet uti possim. Dat. tertio cal. aug. an. sec. Romæ.

Published ed. (IX., 22) agrees with 2nd version up to sacra conficienda.

## LETTER TO PIACENZA, 5 MAII 1513.

Cod. Ambros. P. 130.	Original Despatch in the Arch. stor. Ital. App., VI., 20. Leo PP. X.	First Version of the Cod. Vatic.
<p>Prioribus Placentiae.</p> <p>Vestram erga sedem apostolicam atque nos reverentiam, quam dil. filii Lazarus Malvicinus notarius noster oratorque apud nos vester et comes Nicolaus Scottus nobis significarunt libenter accepimus, etc.</p> <p>(Remainder, including the date, is missing.)</p>	<p>Dilecti filii salutem et apostolicam benedictionem.</p> <p>Vestram erga sedem apostolicam atque nos reverentiam, quam dil. filii Lazarus Malvicinus notarius, vester orator, qui apud nos venit, et comes Nicolaus Scottus nobis significaverunt, libenter accepimus. Et quidem studium et onera adhibuimus ut ad sedis apostolicae deditionem rediretis. Redundantis una vos in sinu paterno caritatis recipimus dabimusque operam ut vos urbemque istam ita tractemus ut [n]unquam vestrae erga nos observantiae poeniteat.</p> <p>Datum Romae apud s. Petrum sub anulo piscatoris die quinto maii 1513 pontif. nostri [anno] primo.</p>	<p>Reverentia osservantiaque vestra que Lazarus Malvicinus et Nicolaus Scottus oratores vestri mihi vestro nomine diligenter prestiterunt grata atque optata accidit. Itaque de eo studio quod quidem maximum, sub reipublicae ditionem atque imperium ut rediretis, communi omnium consensu adhibuistis et laudo et redeuntis in tutelam clientelamque recipio daboque operam ut magis magisque in dies singulos id voluisse vos atque fecisse laetemini.</p> <p>Dat. tertio non. maias an. pr. Roma [sic].</p>

The 2nd version of the Cod. Vat. agrees with the published edition, II., 35.

The Cod. Ambros. P. 130 is of such extraordinary importance that it is necessary to consider it at some length; the more so as Mazzuchelli (*loc. cit.*) confines himself to quotations and does not deal with the MS. in itself. Nor has any use been made of it as yet in other ways. I proceed to give a detailed description and analysis of the same, as well as a tabular comparison of the Codex with the printed letters, for which I am indebted to the kindness of my pupil and present colleague Dr Dengel.

The MS. is a quarto volume bound in parchment.

On the back are two earlier marks: "413," and "CXLIII," with the modern mark "130."

1. Fly-leaf: T. n° 413 (struck out).

P. Bembi Brevia [nomine Leonis P. P. X.] non expolita, sed eo modo, quo fuerunt missa [eorum indices habes in principio]. (The passages in brackets are [later] additions

in another hand. Mazzuchelli, *Scrittori*, II., 2, 765, does not give these.)

Then follow five blank fly-leaves.

7. Fly-leaf: Index epistolarum, quae non sunt in libro edito, et sunt in hoc libro. Epistolae † signatae sunt in additis ex cod. manu Petri Bembi. (This inscription is in the same hand as the passages in brackets above [fly-leaf 1.]. Now follows, in another hand (the same which wrote the Codex), the enumeration of the addresses in alphabetical order with indication of the folio.

8. Fly-leaf: in connection with the previous index follows: Index epistolarum editarum, quae non sunt in hoc libro m. scripto. Inscription and index are in the same hand as the passages in brackets.

9. Blank fly-leaf.

Here begin the letters and the accompanying pagination of the Codex. On the margin of each letter is its number and that of the book, e.g. libro primo, epistola 1. This is continued as far as fol. 229<sup>b</sup> (libro XVI, epist. XIII).

Fol. 1–229 entirely in one and the same hand (A), fine legible writing with very few corrections. The characters are those of the end of the sixteenth century.

Fol. 230 and 231 blank.

Fol. 232–241. Continuation of the letters from Book XVI, and certainly in another hand (B), which is very significant. This writing is also in a clear hand certainly belonging to the first half of the sixteenth century. The whole quinterno (fol. 232–241) is probably taken from another codex, as appears from its somewhat smaller size. This other codex was not paged.

Fol. 242–243 the hand A follows again.

Fol. 244–245 blank.

Fol. 246 in the hand B to the end (five quinterni and two sheets attached) and in the smaller size. This contains letters from various books. The paging ends with fol. 297. Then follow (of the size of MS. B) five blank leaves.\*

\* The word "missing," in the following tables, means that in the Cod. Ambros. the letter in question has not got the number and book of the corresponding *epistola* like the rest of the letters; the majority, but not all, of such letters are also wanting in the published edition.



CONTENTS OF THE CODEX AMBROS., AND COMPARISON OF THE SAME WITH THE  
PRINTED EDITION OF BASLE, 1539, WHICH IS BASED UPON IT.

Codex P. 130.			Address and Date in Codex P. 130.	Cf. the printed ed. : Petri Bembi epistolae, Basileae, 1539.
Fol.	Lib.	Epist.		
1 <sup>a</sup>	I	1	Duci Venetiarum 1513 Martii 14	Substance identical, form different.
1 <sup>b</sup>	I	2	Marchioni Mantuae „ „ 15	„ „
2 <sup>a</sup>	I	3	Petro Bibienae Venetiis nuntio „ „ 16	„ „
2 <sup>b</sup>	I	4	Leonardo Lauredano duci Venet. „ 16	„ „
2 <sup>b</sup>	I	5	Sigismundo regi Poloniae „ „ 16	„ „
4 <sup>a</sup>	I	6	Ep. Eserniensi „ „ 18	„ „
4 <sup>a</sup>	I	8	Duci et Antianis Ianuae „ „ 22	„ „
4 <sup>b</sup>	I	7	Viceregi Neapol. et aliis official. „ 23	„ „
5 <sup>a</sup>	I	9	Prospero Columnae „ „ 25	„ „
5 <sup>b</sup>	I	10	Vicelegato Marchiae „ „ 25	„ „
6 <sup>a</sup>	I	11	Paulo Capello „ „ 26	„ „
6 <sup>a</sup>	I	12	Locumtenent. et conventui Rhodi „ 26	„ „
7 <sup>b</sup>	I	13	Electo Feltrensi nuntio „ „ 29	„ „
8 <sup>a</sup>	I	14	M. Ant <sup>o</sup> Columnae „ „ 28	„ „
8 <sup>b</sup>	I	15	Raim. de Cordova proregi Neap. 1513 Penultima Martii	„ „
8 <sup>b</sup>	I	16	Antianis presidentibus civit. Regii 1513 Ultima Martii	„ „
9 <sup>a</sup>	I	17	Marchioni Padulae 1513 Ultima Martii	„ „
10 <sup>a</sup>	I	18	Iuliano de Medicis nostro fratri 1513 Martii 31	„ „
11 <sup>a</sup>	I	19	Marchioni Padulae 1513 April 1	„ „
11 <sup>a</sup>	I	20	Proregi Neapoli „ „ 1	„ „
11 <sup>a</sup>	I	21	Iacobo Ungariae regi „ „ 1 (In margin, in the hand which drew up the index on fly-leaf 8, the remark: in edito Vladislao Pann. Boëm.)	„ „
11 <sup>b</sup>	I	22	Sigism. Poloniae regi 1513 April 1	„ „
12 <sup>b</sup>	I	23	Regi Britanniae „ „ 3	„ „
13 <sup>b</sup>	I	24	Monialibus muratarum Florentiae „ 3	„ „
14 <sup>a</sup>	I	25	Raym. de Cordova proregi Neapol. 1513 April 3	„ „
14 <sup>b</sup>	I	26	Maxim. Mariae duci Mediol. 1513 April 3	„ „
14 <sup>b</sup>	I	27	Ferdinando Aragoniae regi Catholico 1513 April 4	„ „
15 <sup>b</sup>	I	28	Bernardino de S <sup>to</sup> Severino Bissiniani prin- cipi 1513 April 9	„ „
15 <sup>b</sup>	I	29	Comiti Ioanni Boiardo „ „ 12	„ „
16 <sup>a</sup>	I	30	Th. Campegio et Cornelio Galanti 1513 April 15	„ „
16 <sup>a</sup>	II	1	Petro Bibienae Venetiis nuntio 1513 April 13	„ „
16 <sup>b</sup>	II	2	Locumtenent. et conventui Rhodi 1513 April 10	„ „
17 <sup>a</sup>	II	3	Raphaello Besalu et sociis mercatoribus Venetiis commorantibus 1513 April 11	„ „
17 <sup>a</sup>	II	4	Ant. Mariae march. Pallavicino „ „ 11	„ „
17 <sup>b</sup>	II	5	Ioanni Paulo de Balionibus „ „ 13	„ „
18 <sup>a</sup>	II	6	Franc. Pulicae commiss <sup>rio</sup> nostro 1513 April 13	„ „

Codex P. 130.			Address and Date in Codex P. 130.	Cf. the printed ed. : Petri Bembi epistolae, Basileae, 1539.
Fol.	Lib.	Epist.		
18 <sup>a</sup>	II	7	Ep. Polensi civ. nostrae Bononiae gubern. 1513 April 13	Subst. ident., form dif.
19 <sup>a</sup>	II	8	Francisco Mariae duci Urbini „ „ 17	„ „
19 <sup>b</sup>	II	9	Petro Bibienae nuntio „ „ 20	„ „
20 <sup>a</sup>	II	10	Octaviano electo Laudens. „ „ 23	„ „
20 <sup>a</sup>	II	11	Maximil. Mariae duci Mediol. „ „ 23	„ „
20 <sup>a</sup>	II	12	Prioribus civit. Arimin. „ „ 23	„ „
20 <sup>b</sup>	II	13	Laurentio Campegio „ „ 26	„ „
			(In margin, in the hand which drew up the index on fly-leaf 8, the remark: in edito Thomae episc. Feltrinor. internuntio.)	
20 <sup>b</sup>	II	14	Alfonso Estensi duci Ferrariæ 1513 April 27	„ Missing.
21 <sup>a</sup>	II	15	Francisco Marchioni Mantuae „ „ 29	
21 <sup>b</sup>	—	—	Gubernatori civit. Rhegii „ „ 29 (Refers to the war-tax.)	
22 <sup>a</sup>	II	16	Regi Daciae 1513 April 20	Subst. ident., form dif.
22 <sup>b</sup>	II	17	Hipp. diacono card. Estensi „ „ 24	„ „
23 <sup>a</sup>	—	—	Francisco marchioni Mantuae „ „ 25	Missing.
23 <sup>b</sup>	II	18	P. ep. Forosempronien. „ „ 30	Subst. ident., form dif.
23 <sup>b</sup>	II	19	Sigism. regi Poloniae 1513 Ultimo Apr.	„ „
24 <sup>b</sup>	II	20	Alberto march. Brandeb. „ „	„ „
25 <sup>a</sup>	II	21	Filiis conventui ord. Theuthon 1513 Ultima Aprilis	„ „
26 <sup>a</sup>	—	—	Galeatio, Ant <sup>io</sup> Mae ceterisque Pallavicinis fratribus, Dat. Romae die (a gap) Aprilis 1513 a. primo	Missing.
26 <sup>b</sup>	II	22	Gubernatori Bononiae 1513 Maii 1	Subst. ident., form dif.
	II	23	(Missing in Codex.)	
26 <sup>b</sup>	II	24	Martello thesaur. Rhegii 1513 Maii 1	„ „
26 <sup>b</sup>	II	25	Civib. et mercant. Lucensibus tribus 1513 Maii 21	„ „
27 <sup>a</sup>	II	26	Evang. Tarascono et Iacobo Gambaro, commissariis nostris 1513 Maii 23	„ „
27 <sup>a</sup>	II	27	Quibusdam fratribus ordinis etc. Neapolitanis 1513 Maii 26	„ „
27 <sup>b</sup>	—	—	Gubernatori Bononiae „ „ 25	Missing.
27 <sup>b</sup>	—	—	Episc. Polen. civ. Bononiae gubern. 1513 Maii 20	„ „
28 <sup>a</sup>	II	29	Gubern. Bononiae 1513 Ultima Maii	Subst. ident., form dif.
28 <sup>a</sup>	II	30	Helvetiis duodecim cantonum 1513 Ultima Maii	„ „
28 <sup>b</sup>	II	28	Annib., Ant. Galeatio, Alex. et Hermeti de Bentivolis 1513 Maii 25	„ „
30 <sup>a</sup>	II	31	Gubern. Rhegii et M. Martello thesaur. Camerae apost. 1513 Maii 1	„ „
30 <sup>a</sup>	—	—	Gubern. Bononiensi „ „ 1	Missing.
30 <sup>b</sup>	II	33	Leonardo Laured. duci Venet. „ „ 2	Subst. ident., form dif.
30 <sup>b</sup>	II	32	Petro Bibienae „ „ 2	Subst. ident., form very dif.
30 <sup>b</sup> <sup>a</sup>	II	33*	Ruffino civ. Rhegii locumten. „ „ 3	Missing.
30 <sup>b</sup> <sup>a</sup>	II	34	Prioribus Parmae No date	Subst. ident., form dif.
30 <sup>b</sup> <sup>a</sup>	II	35	Prioribus Placentiae „	„ „

\* Sic.

Codex P. 130.			Address and Date in Codex P. 130.		Cf. the printed ed. : Petri Bembi epistolae, Basileae, 1539.
Fol.	Lib.	Epist.			
30b <sup>b</sup>	II	32*	Campegio Mediol. nuntio	1513 Maii 5	Subst. ident., form dif.
30b <sup>b</sup>	II	37	M. Ant. Columnae	" " 5	" " "
30b <sup>b</sup>	—	—	P. Bibienae nuntio Venetiis	" " 6	Missing.
30c <sup>a</sup>	II	38	Bononiae gubernat.	" " 12	Subst. ident., form dif.
30c <sup>a</sup>	II	39	Guido [sic] Vainae	" " 14	" " "
30c <sup>a</sup>	II	40	Marchioni Mantuae	" " 14	" " "
30c <sup>b</sup>	II	41	Gubern. Bononiae	" " 15	" " "
31 <sup>a</sup>	II	42	Gubern. Fori Livii	" Junii 2	" " "
31 <sup>a</sup>	—	—	Ursino Mugnano (Command to come to Rome for an interview.)	" " 5	Missing.
31 <sup>a</sup>	II	43	Duci Ferraræ	1513 Junii 6	Subst. ident., form dif.
31 <sup>b</sup>	II	44	Duci Venetiarum	" " 6	" " "
32 <sup>a</sup>	II	45	Ep. Polen. referendario. Bonon. gubern.	1513 Junii 9	" " "
32 <sup>a</sup>	II	46	Armor. ductoribus et eorum locumten. qui Bononiae sunt	1513 Junii 9	" " "
32 <sup>b</sup>	III	2	Viceregi Neapol.	" " 12	" " "
33 <sup>a</sup>	—	—	Viceregi Neapol. (Orders concerning the Pallavicini family.)	" " 12	Missing.
33 <sup>a</sup>	III	3	Duci Mediol.	1513 Junii 12	Subst. ident., form dif.
33 <sup>b</sup>	III	5	Duci Mediol.	" " 12	" " "
34 <sup>a</sup>	III	1	Duci Mediol.	" " 12	" " "
34 <sup>b</sup>	—	—	S. Federis cap. gener.	" " 12	Missing.
34 <sup>b</sup>	III	6	Duci Mediol.	" " 13	Subst. ident., form dif.
35 <sup>a</sup>	III	7	Gubern. Parmæ	" " 16	" " "
35 <sup>a</sup>	III	8	Magistro seu locumt. et conv. Rhodi	1513 Junii 16	" " "
35 <sup>b</sup>	III	10	Magistro seu locumt. et conv. Rhodi	1513 Junii 20	" " "
36 <sup>a</sup>	III	9	Gubern. Bononiae	1513 Junii 19	" " "
36 <sup>b</sup>	III	11	Duci Ferrar.	" " 20	" " "
37 <sup>a</sup>	III	12	Gubern. Bononiae	" " 23	" " "
37 <sup>a</sup>	III	13	Gubern. Ravennae	" " 23	" " "
37 <sup>b</sup>	III	14	Duci Mediol.	" " 24	" " "
38 <sup>a</sup>	III	15	Duci Ferrar.	" " 24	" " "
38 <sup>b</sup>	III	16	Eidem	" " 25	" " "
38 <sup>b</sup>	III	17	Duci Urbini	" " 27	" " "
39 <sup>a</sup>	III	18	Helvetiis	" " 28	" " "
39 <sup>b</sup>	III	19	Duci Mediolani	" " 28	" " "
40 <sup>a</sup>	III	20	Duci Urbini	" " 28	" " "
40 <sup>b</sup>	III	21	Imperatori	" " 28	" " "
42 <sup>a</sup>	III	22	Petro Bibienae Venet. nuntio	" Ultima Iunii	" " "
42 <sup>a</sup>	III	23	Maxim. duci Mediolani	" Julii 3	" " "
42 <sup>b</sup>	III	24	Ioach. march. Brandeb.	" " 3	" " "
42 <sup>b</sup>	—	—	Depositario B. M. de Laureto (To come at once to Rome.) In margin, in hand- writing of fly-leaf 8, the remark : in add. ch. i.	" " 5	Missing.
43 <sup>a</sup>	III	25	Max. Mariae duci Mediol.	1513 Julii 7	Subst. ident., form dif.
43 <sup>a</sup>	III	26	Franc. Mariae duci Urbini	" " 8	" " "
43 <sup>b</sup>	III	27	Commissario Bonon.	" " 9	" " "

\* Sic ; a mistake for 36.

Codex P. 130.			Address and Date in Codex P. 130.		Cf. the printed ed. : Petri Bembi epistolae, Basileae, 1539.
Fol.	Lib.	Epist.			
43 <sup>b</sup>	III	28	Max. Mariae d. Mediol.	1513 Julii 9	Subst. ident., form dif.
44 <sup>a</sup>	—	—	Max. Mariae d. Mediol.	" " 11	Missing.
44 <sup>b</sup>	III	29	Altosaxo exercitus Elvet. cap <sup>neo</sup>	" " 12	Subst. ident., form dif.
45 <sup>a</sup>	III	30	Anselmo Crafel * acolyto	" " 12	" "
45 <sup>a</sup>	—	—	Episc. Verulano apud Helvetios nuntio	1513 Julii 13	Missing.
45 <sup>b</sup>	—	—	Helvetiis	1513 Julii 13	"
45 <sup>b</sup>	IV	I	Helvetiis eccl. lib. defens.	" " 14	Subst. ident., form dif.
46 <sup>b</sup>	—	—	Depositario eccl. S. Mariae de Laureto	1513 Julii 16	Missing.
			(To come at once) In margin, in above-named hand : in add. ch. 1.		
46 <sup>b</sup>	—	—	Gubern. et Communitati civit. Arimin.	1513 Julii 16	"
			(To pay at once the sums owing to the Castellan.)		
47 <sup>a</sup>	IV	2	Max. Mariae D. Mediol.	1513 Julii 17	Subst. ident., form dif.
47 <sup>b</sup>	IV	3	Lucretiae d. Ferrariæ	" " 18	" Missing "
48 <sup>a</sup>	—	—	Laurentio Malvitio Bonon.	" " 22	Missing.
			(To come at once).		
48 <sup>a</sup>	IV	4	Herculi Marescotto Bonon.	" " 22	Subst. ident., form dif.
48 <sup>b</sup>	IV	6	Gub. et 40 viris civ. Bonon.	" " 23	" "
49 <sup>a</sup>	IV	7	Max. Mariae duci Mediol.	" " 24	" "
49 <sup>b</sup>	IV	5	Marco Ant. Columnæ	" " 23	" "
50 <sup>a</sup>	IV	8	Marco Musuro Cretensi	Aug. 6	" "
50 <sup>a</sup>	IV	9	Castellano Veruculi	" " 11	" "
50 <sup>b</sup>	IV	10	Imperatorii	" " 13	" "
51 <sup>a</sup>	IV	11	Angelo Cospo	" " 15	" "
51 <sup>a</sup>	IV	12	Herculi Marescotto	" " 15	" "
51 <sup>a</sup>	IV	13	Laurent. Malvitio	" " 15	" "
51 <sup>b</sup>	IV	14	Annib. Bentivolo	" " 29	" "
51 <sup>b</sup>	IV	15	Gubern. Perusiae	" " 29	" "
52 <sup>a</sup>	IV	16	Malatestae Balioni	" " 29	" "
53 <sup>a</sup>	IV	17	Malatestae Balioni	1513 Penultima Aug.	" "
53 <sup>b</sup>	IV	18	Gubern. Forilivii	1513 Ultima Aug.	" "
53 <sup>b</sup>	IV	19	Vicecancellario	1513 Sept. 4	" "
54 <sup>a</sup>	IV	24	Ioanni Saxatello (in margin : Regi Ungariae de Turcis)	1513 Sept. 16	" "
54 <sup>a</sup>	IV	23	Ant. abbati S. Bertini	" " 9	" "
54 <sup>b</sup>	IV	25	Card. Mantuano	" " 10	" "
55 <sup>a</sup>	V	7	Regi cath. de creatione card.	" " 8	" "
56 <sup>a</sup>	V	8	Octav. Fregosio duci Ianuae	" " 25	" "
56 <sup>b</sup>	—	—	Ursino de Ursinis	" " 23	Missing.
			(To come at once).		
56 <sup>b</sup>	V	9	Gub. Bonon.	Die (a gap !) Sept. 1513	Subst. ident., form dif.
57 <sup>a</sup>	V	10	Card. Grimano	No date	" "
57 <sup>a</sup>	IV	20	Gub. Rhegii et Parmae	1513 Sept. 5	" "
57 <sup>b</sup>	IV	21	Gub. Rhegii	" " 12	" "
57 <sup>b</sup>	V	2	Marchioni Mantuae	" " 17	" "
58 <sup>a</sup>	V	4	Duci Mediol.	" " 17	" "
58 <sup>b</sup>	V	3	Card. Gonzagae	" " 17	" "
58 <sup>b</sup>	V	5	Gub. Rhegii	" " 19	" "

\* In printed ed. : Crafeio (Grafevio).



Codex P. 130.			Address and Date in Codex P. 130.		Cf. the printed ed. : Petri Bembi epistolae, Basileae, 1539.
Fol.	Lib.	Epist.			
59 <sup>a</sup>	V	6	Comiti Ioan. Boiardo	1513 Sept. 19	Subst. ident., form dif.
59 <sup>a</sup>	V	1	Card. S. P. ad vincula	" " 20	" " "
59 <sup>b</sup>	—	—	Episc. Pistoriensi	" " 25	Missing.
			(To set free Ludov. Zandorus : in margin, in above-named hand : in addit. ch. 2.)		
60 <sup>a</sup>	V	11	Petro Bibienae	1513 Oct. 29	Subst. ident., form dif.
60 <sup>b</sup>	V	23	Helvetiis	No date	" " "
60 <sup>b</sup>	V	24	Viceregi Neapol.	1513 Oct. 29	" " "
61 <sup>b</sup>	V	13	Communitati Ravennae	" " 5	" " "
61 <sup>b</sup>	—	—	Gubern. Spoleti	" Nov. 6	Missing.
61 <sup>b</sup>	—	—	Mutio Columnae	" Oct. 15	"
			(In margin : in addit. ch. 2.)		
62 <sup>a</sup>	—	—	Viceregi Neapol.	1513 Oct. 12	"
62 <sup>b</sup>	V	21	Card. Sedun.	" " 27	Subst. ident., form dif.
63 <sup>a</sup>	V	22	Laurentio Medici	" " 17	" " "
63 <sup>a</sup>	—	—	Card. Bonon.	" " 24	Missing.
63 <sup>b</sup>	—	—	Hieronymo Casio	" " 5	" " "
64 <sup>a</sup>	V	16	Duci Venet.	" " 10	Subst. ident., form dif.
64 <sup>a</sup>	V	17	Duci Genuae	" " 9	" " "
64 <sup>b</sup>	V	14	Gub. Bonon.	" " 3	" " "
64 <sup>b</sup>	V	15	Card. de Grassis	" " 3	" " "
64 <sup>b</sup>	—	—	Card. Bonon.	" " 18	Missing.
			(In margin : in addit. ch. 3.)		
65 <sup>a</sup>	V	12	Card. de Grassis	1513 Oct. 3	Subst. ident., form dif.
65 <sup>a</sup>	—	—	Gub. Bonon.	" " 28	Missing.
65 <sup>b</sup>	V	18	Card. Grimani	No date	Subst. ident., form dif.
65 <sup>b</sup>	V	19	Regi Anglie	1513 Oct. 11	" " "
67 <sup>a</sup>	V	25	Gubern. Bonon.	" " 28	" " "
67 <sup>a</sup>	V	20	Electo Feltr. et Paulo Sumontio	1513 Oct. 20	Subst. ident., form dif.
67 <sup>b</sup>	V	26	Duci Mediol.	1513 Oct. 27	" " "
67 <sup>b</sup>	V	27	Viceregub. Placentiae et Paulo Sumontio	1513 Nov. 28	" " "
68 <sup>a</sup>	V	28	Viceregi Neapol.	1513 Nov. 3	" " "
68 <sup>b</sup>	V	29	Duci Urbini	" " 3	" " "
68 <sup>b</sup>	—	—	Card. Bonon.	" Oct. 4	Missing.
68 <sup>b</sup>	—	—	Gub. Bonon.	" " 4	" " "
69 <sup>a</sup>	V	30	Duci Ianuae	" Nov. 5	Subst. ident., form dif.
69 <sup>a</sup>	V	31	Gub. Parmae	" " 5	" " "
69 <sup>b</sup>	V	32	Card. Gurcensi	" " 5	" " "
69 <sup>b</sup>	V	33	Nursinis	" " 6	" " "
69 <sup>b</sup>	—	—	Thomae Campegio Placent. gubern. et Ludov. Castrocaro commissario	1513 Nov. 5	Missing.
			(In margin : in add. ch. 3.)		
70 <sup>a</sup>	V	34	Fabritio et M. Ant. Columnae	1513 Nov. 6	Subst. ident., form dif.
70 <sup>a</sup>	V	35	March. Pescarae	" " 6	" " "
70 <sup>b</sup>	V	36	March. Mantuae	" " 10	" " "
70 <sup>b</sup>	VI	2	Ducissae Ferrariae	" " 20	" " "
71 <sup>b</sup>	VI	3	Duci Mediol.	" " 20	" " "
72 <sup>a</sup>	VI	1	Duci Ferrariae	" " 20	" " "
72 <sup>b</sup>	VI	4	March. Montisferrati	" " 20	" " "
73 <sup>a</sup>	VI	5	Rhegi gubernat.	(a gap) Nov. 1513	" " "

Codex P. 130.			Address and Date in Codex P. 130.	<i>Cf. the printed ed. : Petri Bembi epistolae, Basileae, 1539.</i>
Fol.	Lib.	Epist.		
73 <sup>b</sup>	VI	6	Com. Ioanni Petro de Nuvolara 1513 Nov. 24	Subst. ident., form dif.
73 <sup>b</sup>	VI	7	Gub. Bonon. " " 24	" "
74 <sup>a</sup>	VI	8	Card. Bonon. " " 24	" "
74 <sup>a</sup>	VI	9	Viceregi Neapol. " " 25	" "
75 <sup>a</sup>	—	—	10 viris Bonon. " " 25	Missing.
75 <sup>a</sup>	VI	10	Ep. Cerviensi Cesenae gub. " " 29	Subst. ident., form dif.
75 <sup>b</sup>	VI	11	Duci Urbini " " 29	" "
75 <sup>b</sup>	VI	12	Helvetiis apud Genuam " " 30	" "
76 <sup>a</sup>	—	—	Duci Ferrariæ " Dec. 1	Missing.
76 <sup>a</sup>	VI	13	Pontiscurvi officialibus " " 2	Subst. ident., form dif.
76 <sup>a</sup>	VI	14	Card. de Grassis " " 5	" "
77 <sup>a</sup>	VI	15	March. Montisf. " " 22	" "
77 <sup>b</sup>	VI	16	Regi catholico " " 24	" "
77 <sup>b</sup>	VI	18	Archiep. Salernit. " " 28	" "
78 <sup>a</sup>	VI	17	Nuntio in Hispaniis " " 24	" "
78 <sup>a</sup>	VI	19	Gubern. Bonon. " " 29	" "
78 <sup>b</sup>	VI	20	Duci Ianuæ 1514 Jan. 1	" "
78 <sup>b</sup>	VI	21	P. Bibienae nuntio " " 4	" "
79 <sup>a</sup>	VI	26	Electo Feltrensi " " 7	" "
79 <sup>a</sup>	VI	27	Imperatori " " 7	" "
			(Instead of Antonius Cominatus in Cod. P. 130 Ant. Ruvere.)	
79 <sup>b</sup>	VI	29	Ant. Guiti de la Volta 1514 Jan. 8	" "
80 <sup>a</sup>	VI	28	Gubern. Bonon. " " 8	" "
80 <sup>a</sup>	VI	30	Barthol. Alviano " " 9	" "
80 <sup>b</sup>	VI	31	Viceregi Neapol. " " 10	" "
81 <sup>a</sup>	VI	32	Marchioni Brandeb. " " 10	" "
81 <sup>a</sup>	—	—	Petro Bibienae " " 13	Missing.
			(In margin : in add. ch. 3.)	
81 <sup>b</sup>	VI	33	Locumten. Neapol. " " 13	Subst. ident., form dif.
82 <sup>a</sup>	VI	34	Gub. Parmæ et Rhegii " " 16	" "
82 <sup>a</sup>	VI	35	Duci Mediol. " " 22	" "
82 <sup>b</sup>	VI	36	Sesse Gubernatori " " 25	" "
83 <sup>a</sup>	VI	37	Ep. Verulano " " 27	" "
83 <sup>a</sup>	VI	38	Uni ex primatibus Helvet. " " 27	" "
83 <sup>b</sup>	VII	1	Regi Franciæ " " 30	" "
84 <sup>a</sup>	VII	2	Filiæ regis Franc. " " 30	" "
84 <sup>b</sup>	VII	3	Cantono Brensellæ [sic] Helv. 1514 Ultima Jan.	" "
85 <sup>a</sup>	VII	4	Viceregi Neapol. 1514 Ultima Jan.	" "
85 <sup>b</sup>	—	—	Viceregi Neapol. 1514 Febr. 1	Missing.
86 <sup>a</sup>	—	—	Burghesio " " 3	" "
86 <sup>a</sup>	VII	5	Viceregi Neapolis " " 5	Subst. ident., form dif.
86 <sup>b</sup>	VII	6	Magno Magistro Rhodi " " 6	" "
87 <sup>b</sup>	VII	7	Magno Magistro Rhodi " " 7	" "
87 <sup>b</sup>	VII	8	Gub. Bonon. " " 7	" "
88 <sup>a</sup>	VII	9	Gub. Bonon. " " 7	" "
89 <sup>a</sup>	VII	11	Locumten. mag. Rhodi in regno Neap. 1514 Febr. 6	" "
89 <sup>a</sup>	VII	10	Card. Bonon. 1514 Febr. 7	" "
90 <sup>a</sup>	VII	12	Petro Remiræ Sinvessæ gub. " " 8	" "
90 <sup>b</sup>	VII	13	Duci Mediolani " " 14	" "
90 <sup>b</sup>	VII	14	Imperatori " " 15	" "

Codex P. 130.			Address and Date in Codex P. 130.		Cf. the printed ed. : Petri Bembi epistolae, Basileae, 1539.
Fol.	Lib.	Epist.			
91 <sup>a</sup>	VII	15	Electo Feltrensi nuntio	1514 Febr. 15	Subst. ident., form dif.
91 <sup>a</sup>	VII	16	Regi catholico	" " 15	" "
91 <sup>b</sup>	VII	17	Duci Venet.	" " 15	" "
92 <sup>a</sup>	VII	18	Ep. Forosempron.	" " 16	" "
92 <sup>a</sup>	—	—	Duci Venet.	" " 20	Missing.
92 <sup>b</sup>	VII	20	Andreae de Burgo	" " 24	Subst. ident., form dif.
92 <sup>b</sup>	VII	19	Duci Mediolani	" " 24	" "
93 <sup>a</sup>	VII	21	Burghesio Petrucio	" Martii 7	" "
93 <sup>a</sup>	VII	22	Viceregi Neapol.	" " 14	" "
93 <sup>b</sup>	VII	23	Balthasari Castilionio	" " 11	" "
94 <sup>a</sup>	VII	24	Gubern. Parmae	" " 13	" "
94 <sup>b</sup>	VII	25	Galeatio Pallavicino	" " 13	" "
95 <sup>a</sup>	VII	26	Feudat. Parmens.	" " 13	" "
95 <sup>a</sup>	VII	28	Duci Mediol.	" " 14	" "
95 <sup>b</sup>	VII	27	Troilo Rubeo	" " 14	" "
96 <sup>a</sup>	VII	29	Com. Ioan. Petro Gonzagae	" " 17	" "
96 <sup>b</sup>	VII	31	Ioan. Saxatello	" " 18	" "
96 <sup>b</sup>	VII	30	Vicegub. Placent.	" " 18	" "
96 <sup>b</sup>	—	—	Galeatio Pallavicino	" " 18	Missing.
97 <sup>a</sup>	VIII	1	Duci Urbini 1513 (sic; clearly a slip for 1514) Martii 4	1514 Martii 4	Subst. ident., form dif.
98 <sup>a</sup>	VIII	2	Priori Barlettæ	1514 Martii 24	" "
98 <sup>a</sup>	VIII	3	Ioan. Paulo Balioni	" " 26	" "
98 <sup>b</sup>	VIII	4	Iacobo ab armis	" " 27	" "
98 <sup>b</sup>	VIII	5	Gub. et commun. Asculi	" " 28	" "
99 <sup>a</sup>	VIII	6	Magno Rhodi Mag.	" April 1	" "
99 <sup>b</sup>	VIII	7	Priori Lombardiae	" " 1	" "
100 <sup>a</sup>	—	—	Franc. Dño Engolismen.	" " 4	Missing.
100 <sup>b</sup>	VIII	8	Gub. Rhegi	1514 April 2 (or 11)	Subst. ident., form dif.
100 <sup>b</sup>	VIII	9	Card. Sedunen.	1514 April 18	" "
101 <sup>a</sup>	VIII	10	Paulo Victorio	" " 22	" "
101 <sup>b</sup>	VIII	11	Ugoni Pepulo	" " 23	" "
102 <sup>a</sup>	VIII	12	Guido Rangono	" " 23	" "
102 <sup>b</sup>	VIII	13	Duci Mediol.	" " 23	" "
103 <sup>a</sup>	VIII	14	Regi catholico	" " 28	" "
104 <sup>a</sup>	VIII	15	Duci Venet.	" Maii 1	" "
104 <sup>b</sup>	VIII	16	Gub. Arimini	" " 7	" "
104 <sup>b</sup>	VIII	17*	Gub. eccl. Lauret.	" Junii 12	Missing.
105 <sup>a</sup>	—	—	Recanatensibus	" " 16	Subst. ident., form† dif.
105 <sup>b</sup>	VIII	18	Imperatori	" " 16	" "
105 <sup>b</sup>	—	—	Nicolao Scotto	" " 18	Missing.
106 <sup>a</sup>	VIII	19	Ioanni de Luna	" " 20	Subst. ident., form dif.
106 <sup>b</sup>	VIII	24	Duci Sabaudiae	" " 21	" "
107 <sup>a</sup>	VIII	25	Comiti Gebennensi	" " 12	" "
107 <sup>a</sup>	VIII	26	Baliae Senensium	" " 24	" "
107 <sup>b</sup>	VIII	28	Reip. Florent.	" " 24	" "
107 <sup>b</sup>	VIII	27	Pindaro Santesio	" " 24	" "
108 <sup>a</sup>	VIII	29	Regi Hungariae	" " 27	" "
108 <sup>b</sup>	VIII	30	Gub. Parmae	" " 26	" "
108 <sup>b</sup>	VIII	32	Electo Feltr.	" Julii 8	" "
109 <sup>a</sup>	—	—	Card. Gurgensi	" " 8	Missing.

\* Sic.

† VIII 17.

Codex P. 130.			Address and Date in Codex P. 130.			Cf. the printed ed. : Petri Bembi epistolae, Basileae, 1539.
Fol.	Lib.	Epist.				
109 <sup>a</sup>	—	—	Vito Trusto	1514 Julii 8	Missing.	
109 <sup>b</sup>	IX	1	Comiti Fed. Lando	" " 15	Subst. ident., form dif.	
110 <sup>a</sup>	IX	2	Cap. et can. eccl. Veron.	" " 17	" "	
110 <sup>a</sup>	IX	4	Livoniae Magistro	" " 17	" "	
111 <sup>a</sup>	IX	5	Ant. Mariae Pallavicino	" " 19	" "	
111 <sup>b</sup>	IX	6	Duci Mediol.	" " 19	" "	
111 <sup>b</sup>	—	—	Duci Sabaudiae	" " 18	Missing.	
112 <sup>a</sup>	—	—	Marchioni Mantuae	" " 20	"	
112 <sup>a</sup>	—	—	Alex. Gablonete archid. Mantuan.	1514 Julii 20	"	
112 <sup>a</sup>	IX	7	Ludov. Tornabonae	1514 " 23	Subst. ident., form dif.	
112 <sup>b</sup>	IX	8	Ariminens.	" " 24	" "	
112 <sup>b</sup>	IX	11	Galeatio et Ant. M. Pallav.	" " 26	" "	
113 <sup>a</sup>	IX	9	Com. Petro Mariae Scotto	" " 27	" "	
113 <sup>b</sup>	IX	10	Plac. gub.	" " 27	" "	
114 <sup>a</sup>	IX	12	Philippo Capello etc.	" " 28	" "	
114 <sup>b</sup>	IX	13	Raphaelo pictori *	" Aug. 1	" "	
115 <sup>a</sup>	—	—	Iuliano de S <sup>to</sup> Gallo †	" " 1	Missing.	
115 <sup>a</sup>	—	—	Iocundo architetto ‡	" " 1	"	
115 <sup>b</sup>	—	—	Gub. Bononiae	" " 5	"	
115 <sup>b</sup>	—	—	Card. S <sup>ti</sup> Georgii camerario	" " 6	"	
116 <sup>a</sup>	IX	14	Legato Avinion.	" " 7	Subst. ident., form dif.	
116 <sup>a</sup>	—	—	Ant. Mariae Pallavicino	" " 7	Missing.	
116 <sup>b</sup>	—	—	Ant. de Burgo iuris utr. doct.	" " 7	"	
116 <sup>b</sup>	IX	15	Regi Angliae	" " 8	Subst. ident., form dif.	
117 <sup>a</sup>	IX	16	Laurent. Medici	" " 10	" "	
117 <sup>a</sup>	IX	17	Io. et Gentili Saxat[ellis]	" " 12	" "	
117 <sup>b</sup>	IX	19	XL viris Bonon.	" " 12	" "	
118 <sup>a</sup>	IX	18	Duci Ferrariæ	" " 12	" "	
118 <sup>b</sup>	IX	20	Magno Rhodi Mag.	" " 19	" "	
119 <sup>a</sup>	IX	21	Laurent. Medici	" " 22	" "	
119 <sup>b</sup>	IX	22	Marchioni Mantuae	" " 30	" "	
119 <sup>b</sup>	—	—	Alex. archidiacono Mantuano	" " 30	Missing.	
120 <sup>a</sup>	IX	24	Duci Urbini	" " 30	Subst. ident., form dif.	
120 <sup>a</sup>	IX	23	Card. Senensi	1514 Aug. Ultima	" "	
120 <sup>b</sup>	IX	25	Nuntiis in Hisp.	1514 Sept. 2	" "	
120 <sup>b</sup>	—	—	Duci Venet.	" " 3	Missing.	
121 <sup>a</sup>	IX	26	Regi cath <sup>co</sup>	" " 4	Subst. ident., form dif.	
121 <sup>b</sup>	IX	27	Duci Venet.	" " 7	" "	
122 <sup>a</sup>	IX	28	Duci Ferraræ	" " 8	" "	
122 <sup>a</sup>	IX	29	Regi Franciæ	" " 15	" "	
122 <sup>b</sup>	IX	30	Regi christian.	" " 19	" "	
123 <sup>a</sup>	IX	32	Firmanis	" " 19	" "	
123 <sup>b</sup>	—	—	Leon. Bonefidei mag. hosp. S. M. Novæ florentiæ	1514 Sept. 19	Missing.	
123 <sup>b</sup>	IX	33	Helvetiis	" " 20	Subst. ident., form dif.	
124 <sup>a</sup>	IX	31	P. Navarrae	" " 26	" "	
124 <sup>a</sup>	IX	35	Card. Sedunensi	" " 26	" "	
124 <sup>b</sup>	IX	33§	Helvetiis	" " 26	" "	
124 <sup>b</sup>	IX	36	Duci Ferrariæ	" " 28	" "	
125 <sup>a</sup>	IX	37	S. Ferrerio generali Sabaudiae	" " 28	" "	

\* Cf. *supra*, p. 363 n.† *Supra*, p. 363 n.‡ *Supra*, p. 362 n.

§ Sic.



Codex P. 130.			Address and Date in Codex P. 130.	Cf. the printed ed. : Petri Bembi epistolae, Basileae, 1539.
Fol.	Lib.	Epist.		
125 <sup>a</sup>	IX	38	Card. Albreto 1514 Sept. 28	Subst. ident., form dif.
125 <sup>a</sup>	IX	39	Iano Parrhasio " " 28	" "
125 <sup>b</sup>	IX	40	Cap. Triremium " " 30	" "
125 <sup>b</sup>	IX	42	Duci Ianuae et archiep. Salernit. 1514 Oct. 4	" Missing.
126 <sup>a</sup>	—	—	Marchionissae Mantuae 1514 Oct. 9	" "
126 <sup>a</sup>	—	—	Duci Sabaudiae " " 12	Subst. ident., form dif.
126 <sup>b</sup>	IX	43	Regi christ <sup>mo</sup> " " 12	" "
127 <sup>a</sup>	IX	44	Duci Urbini " " 13	Missing.
127 <sup>a</sup>	—	—	Marchionissae Mantuae " " 14	" "
127 <sup>b</sup>	X	1	Io. Neroni comm <sup>rio</sup> nostro " " 7	Subst. ident., form dif.
128 <sup>b</sup>	X	2	Ep <sup>o</sup> Tricaricen. " " 24	" "
129 <sup>a</sup>	X	8	Sebast. Ferrerio " Nov. 3	" "
129 <sup>a</sup>	X	9	Franc. Gherino civi Flor. " " 4	" "
129 <sup>b</sup>	X	10	Bartol. Liviano " " 8	" "
129 <sup>b</sup>	—	—	Card. S. Vitalis " " 14	Missing.
130 <sup>a</sup>	—	—	Domino Longae Villae " " 15	" "
130 <sup>a</sup>	—	—	Ep <sup>o</sup> Forosempronensi " " 20	" "
130 <sup>b</sup>	X	12	Duci Mediol. " " 22	Subst. ident., form dif.
131 <sup>a</sup>	X	13	Duci et Antianis Genuae 1515 Jan. 7	" Missing.
131 <sup>b</sup>	—	—	Philippo Comiti Gebennen " " 9	" "
131 <sup>b</sup>	—	—	Philibertae de Sabaudia " " 9	" "
132 <sup>a</sup>	—	—	Ep <sup>o</sup> Verulano " " 11	" "
132 <sup>a</sup>	—	—	Duci et Antianis Genuae " " 12	" "
132 <sup>b</sup>	—	—	Vicereginae Neapolit. " " 12	" "
132 <sup>b</sup>	X	14	Helvetiis " " 27	Subst. ident., form dif.
133 <sup>b</sup>	X	15	Regi christ <sup>mo</sup> " Febr. 13	" "
134 <sup>b</sup>	X	16	Ducissae Engolismensi " " 14	" Missing.
135 <sup>a</sup>	—	—	Notho Sabaudiae " " 14	" "
135 <sup>a</sup>	X	17	Card. Sedunensi " " 15	Subst. ident., form dif.
135 <sup>b</sup>	X	18	Gubern. Parmae " " 16	" "
136 <sup>a</sup>	X	19	Ioan. Iordano Ursino " " 17	" "
136 <sup>a</sup>	—	—	Asculanis " " 19	Missing.
136 <sup>b</sup>	X	20	Laur. Tuccio civi Flor. 1515 Ultima Febr.	Subst. ident., form dif.
137 <sup>a</sup>	—	—	Blank.	
137 <sup>b</sup>	—	—	Blank.	
138 <sup>a</sup>	—	—	Duci Sabaudiae 1515 Martii 20	Missing.
138 <sup>a</sup>	X	27	Nicol. Leonicensi 1515 Ultima Martii	Subst. ident., form dif.
138 <sup>b</sup>	—	—	Card. Mantuano 1515 Apr. 2	Missing.
138 <sup>b</sup>	X	28	Duci Venet. " " 6	Subst. ident., form dif.
139 <sup>a</sup>	—	—	Duci Mediol. " " 25	Missing.
139 <sup>b</sup>	X	29	Duci Mediol. " " 19	Subst. ident., form dif.
140 <sup>a</sup>	—	—	Hieronymo Morono " " 19	Missing.
140 <sup>b</sup>	X	30	Philippo Gualterotto " Maii 1	Subst. ident., form dif.
140 <sup>b</sup>	X	31	Latino Iuvenali " " 17	" "
141 <sup>a</sup>	—	—	Duci Mediol. " " 17	Missing.
141 <sup>b</sup>	—	—	Ducibus Helvet. in Italia " " 17	" "
141 <sup>b</sup>	—	—	Helvetiis XIII Cantonum " " 17	" "
142 <sup>a</sup>	—	—	Card. Sedunensi " " 17	" "
142 <sup>b</sup>	—	—	Diego de Aquila ori Hisp. Mediol. 1515 Maii 17	" "
142 <sup>b</sup>	X	32	Duci Genuae et archiep. Salernit 1515 Maii 17	Subst. ident., form dif.

Codex P. 130.			Address and Date in Codex P. 130.		Cf. the printed ed. : Petri Bembi epistolae, Basileae, 1539.
Fol.	Lib.	Epist.			
143 <sup>a</sup>	—	—	Antianis Genuae	1515 Maii 17	Missing.
143 <sup>b</sup>	X	33	Viceregi Neapoli	" " 22	Subst. ident., form dif.
143 <sup>b</sup>	X	34	Magistro Rhodi	" " 30	" "
144 <sup>a</sup>	X	36	Ioh. Blassiae trirem. praefecto	" " 30	" "
144 <sup>a</sup>	X	35	Archiep. Salernit. et duci Genuae	" " 30	" "
144 <sup>b</sup>	X	37	Sigism. Trotto	" Junii 8	" "
144 <sup>b</sup>	X	38	Dominis Florent.	" " 17	" "
145 <sup>a</sup>	X	39	Laur. Medici	" " 19	" "
145 <sup>b</sup>	X	40	Lud. Ariosto	" " 20	" "
145 <sup>b</sup>	X	41	Duci Urbini	" " 22	" "
146 <sup>a</sup>	X	42	Antonio S. Crucis	" " 22	" "
146 <sup>a</sup>	X	43	Dom. Plumbini	" " 21	" "
146 <sup>b</sup>	X	44	Card. S. Mariae in Porticu	" Julii 1	" "
147 <sup>a</sup>	X	45	Duci Venet.	" " 5	" "
147 <sup>b</sup>	X	46	Raff. ep. Grosset. [praef.] S. Angeli	1515 Julii 19	" "
147 <sup>b</sup>	—	—	Gubern. Placentiae	1515 Aug. 3	Missing.
148 <sup>a</sup>	X	47	Viceregi Neap.	" " 7	Subst. ident., form dif.
148 <sup>a</sup>	X	48	Regi christ <sup>mo</sup>	" " 7	" "
148 <sup>b</sup>	X	49	Duci Urbini	" " 9	" "
149 <sup>a</sup>	—	—	Ioanni Paulo Balioni	" " 16	Missing.
149 <sup>a</sup>	X	50	Viceleg. Umbriae	" " 16	Subst. ident., form dif.
149 <sup>a</sup>	X	51	Raphaello Urbinati	" " 27	" "
150 <sup>a</sup>	X	52	Regi cath.	" " 28	" "
150 <sup>a</sup>	—	—	Ep <sup>o</sup> Malancitano	" " 28	Missing.
150 <sup>b</sup>	X	53	Helvetiis	" " 30	Subst. ident., form dif.
151 <sup>a</sup>	—	—	Card. Sedunensi	" " 30	Missing.
151 <sup>b</sup>	X	54	Florentinis	" " 30	Subst. ident., form dif.
151 <sup>b</sup>	X	55	Henrico com. Nolae	" " ...*	" "
152 <sup>a</sup>	X	56	Helvetiis	" " ...*	" "
( * Marked thus in Codex.)					
152 <sup>b</sup>	X	57	Vincentio Granatae	1515 Ultima Aug.	" "
152 <sup>b</sup>	X	58	Ragusinis	1515 Sept. 2	" "
153 <sup>a</sup>	—	—	Magno cancellario	1515 Ultima Sept.	Missing.
153 <sup>a</sup>	—	—	Imperatori	No date	Missing. (Cf. XI 13.)
(Credentials for the Orator Egidius ord. Aug. eremit.)					
153 <sup>b</sup>	XI	14	Card. Gircensi	No date	Subst. ident., form dif.
153 <sup>b</sup>	XI	5	Regi christ <sup>mo</sup>	1515 Oct. 4	" "
154 <sup>a</sup>	XI	6	Marco Ant. Columnae	" " 5	" "
154 <sup>b</sup>	XI	7	Gubern. Spoleti	" " 19	" "
155 <sup>a</sup>	XI	8	Viceregi Neapol.	" " 19	" "
155 <sup>b</sup>	XI	9	Cardinalibus singulatim	" " 22	" "
155 <sup>b</sup>	XI	10	Regi Franciae	" Dec. 2	" "
156 <sup>a</sup>	XI	12	Aloisiae Dom. Engolismensi	" " 11	" "
157 <sup>a</sup>	—	—	Archiep. Genuensi	" " 13	Missing.
157 <sup>a</sup>	XI	15	Vinc. Martines praefecto	" " 15	Subst. ident., form dif.
157 <sup>b</sup>	XI	16	Lud. com. S. Bonifacii	" " 15	" "
157 <sup>b</sup>	—	—	Regi Francorum	" " 16	Missing.
158 <sup>a</sup>	—	—	Ep <sup>o</sup> del Furno	" " 23	" "
(In margin : in add. ch. 5.)					
158 <sup>a</sup>	XI	18	Dom. Ligae Grisonorum	1515 Dec. 28	Subst. ident., form dif.
159 <sup>a</sup>	XI	19	Regi Franc.	1516 Jan. 3	" "

Codex P. 130.			Address and Date in Codex P. 130.			Cf. the printed ed.: Petri Bembi epistolae, Basileae, 1579.	
Fol.	Lib.	Epist.					
159 <sup>a</sup>	—	—	Ep <sup>o</sup> Tricaricensi nuntio	1516 Jan.	3	Missing.	
159 <sup>b</sup>	XI	20	Vicel. Viterbii	" "	14	Subst. ident., form dif.	
160 <sup>a</sup>	XI	21	Duci Ferrariae	" "	27	" "	
160 <sup>a</sup>	XI	22	Nuntio in Hispania	" "	29	" "	
160 <sup>a</sup>	XI	23	Ant. abbati S. Bertini	Febr.	1	" "	
160 <sup>b</sup>	XI	26	Carolo regi Hispaniae	" "	12	" "	
161 <sup>a</sup>	XI	27	Ep <sup>o</sup> Vesprimiensi	" "	16	" "	
162 <sup>a</sup>	XI	29	Card. Sedunensi	" "	17	" "	
163 <sup>a</sup>	XI	28	Helvetiis	" "	17	" "	
164 <sup>a</sup>	XI	32	March. Mantuae	" "	18	" "	
164 <sup>b</sup>	—	—	Mediol. gubern.	" "	18	Missing.	
165 <sup>a</sup>	—	—	Ioan. Iacob. Trivultio	" "	18	" "	
165 <sup>a</sup>	XI	30	Io. F. Pico Mirand. com.	" "	18	Subst. ident., form dif.	
165 <sup>b</sup>	XI	31	F. Picae Concordiae comitissae	" "	18	" "	
166 <sup>a</sup>	XI	34	Nuntio apud Helv. ep. Verul.	" "	18	" "	
167 <sup>a</sup>			Blank.				
167 <sup>b</sup>			Blank.				
168 <sup>a</sup>	XI	35	Ducissae Bari	1517 [sic] Martii	10	Subst. ident., form dif.	
						(Printed anno tertio in MS. anno quarto.)	
168 <sup>a</sup>	XI	36	Dom. de Lutrech	" "	10	" "	
168 <sup>b</sup>	XI	37	Dom. de Lutrech	" "	10	" "	
169 <sup>a</sup>	XI	38	Ioan. Paul. Balioni	" "	9	" "	
169 <sup>a</sup>	XII	3	Lud. regi Ung. puero	April	3	Subst. ident., form dif.	
170 <sup>a</sup>	XII	2	Orator. Helv.	" "	3	" "	
170 <sup>b</sup>	XII	4	Ad primates Ung. separatim	" "	4	" "	
171 <sup>a</sup>	XII	5	Cardin. Strigon.	" "	5	" "	
172 <sup>b</sup>	XII	6	Carolo regi Hisp.	1516	7	" "	
173 <sup>a</sup>	XII	7	Sig. regi Pol.	" "	2	" "	
173 <sup>b</sup>	XII	9	Faliscis	" "	26	" "	
174 <sup>a</sup>	XII	8	Viterbiensib.	" "	26	" "	
174 <sup>b</sup>	XII	10	Cornetanis	" "	26	" "	
174 <sup>b</sup>	XII	11	Viceleg. Viterbii	" "	26	" "	
175 <sup>a</sup>	XII	12	Archiep. Salernit.	Maii	5	" "	
175 <sup>b</sup>	XII	13	Ianuæ gub.	" "	5	" "	
176 <sup>a</sup>	XII	14	Abbati S. Bertini	" "	10	" "	
176 <sup>b</sup>	XII	15	Prosp. Columnae	" "	13	" "	
176 <sup>b</sup>	XII	16	Regi Hisp.	" "	16	" "	
177 <sup>b</sup>	XII	17	Laur. Medici	" "	16	" "	
177 <sup>b</sup>	XII	18	Io. Paul. Balioni et Sipiccianni dominis	1516 Maii	16	" "	
178 <sup>a</sup>	XII	19	Electo Feltrensi	1516	18	" "	
178 <sup>b</sup>	XII	20	Comest. Franciae Borboni duci	" "	20	" "	
179 <sup>a</sup>	XII	21	Regi Francor.	" "	20	" "	
179 <sup>b</sup>	XII	22	Duci Borboni	" "	21	" "	
180 <sup>a</sup>	—	—	Duci Ferrariae	" "	21	Missing.	
180 <sup>a</sup>	XII	23	Ep <sup>o</sup> Vesprimiensi	" "	25	Subst. ident., form dif.	
180 <sup>b</sup>	—	—	Gub. et antianis et baliae Ianuae	1516 Ul- tima Maii		Missing.	
180 <sup>b</sup>	XII	25	Imperat.	1516 Junii	1	Subst. ident., form dif.	
181 <sup>a</sup>	XII	26	Urbinatib.	" "	1	" "	
181 <sup>b</sup>	XII	27	Genuensibus	" "	8	" "	
182 <sup>a</sup>	—	—	Antonio Blassiae	" "	20	Missing.	



Codex P. 130.			Address and Date in Codex P. 130.		Cf. the printed ed.: Petri Bembi epistolae, Basileae, 1539.
Fol.	Lib.	Epist.			
182 <sup>b</sup>	XII	29	Agnesinae Columnae	1516 Junii 21	Subst. ident., form dif.
182 <sup>b</sup>	XIII	2	Homin. S. Martini	" " 24	" "
183 <sup>a</sup>	XIII	3	Pet. Io. capitaneo	" " 25	" "
183 <sup>b</sup>	—	—	Duci Albaniae	" Iunii ...	Missing.
184 <sup>a</sup>	XIII	4	Philib. de Sabaudiae	" Junii 30	Subst. ident., form dif.
184 <sup>a</sup>	XIII	5	Duci Sabaudiae	" " 30	" "
184 <sup>b</sup>	XIII	6	Regi christ <sup>mo</sup>	" " 12	" "
185 <sup>a</sup>	XIII	7	Gub. et antianis Ianuae	" Julii 3	" "
185 <sup>b</sup>	XIII	8	Eugubinis	" " 10	" "
185 <sup>b</sup>	XIII	9	Matheo Strozze	" " 10	" "
186 <sup>a</sup>	XIII	10	Card. S. Mariae in Porticu	" " 13	" "
186 <sup>a</sup>	—	—	Senensibus	" " 23	Missing.
186 <sup>b</sup>	—	—	Card. Cibo	" Aug. 5	" "
186 <sup>b</sup>	XIII	11	Duci Gravinae	" " 12	Subst. ident., form dif.
187 <sup>a</sup>	XIII	12	Magno mag. Rhodi	" " 22	" "
188 <sup>a</sup>	XIII	13	Regi Francor.	" " 24	" "
188 <sup>a</sup>	XIII	14	Ep <sup>o</sup> Tricaric.	" " 24	" "
188 <sup>b</sup>	XIII	17	Regi Franc.	" " 27	" "
189 <sup>a</sup>	XIII	18	Duci Venet.	" Sept. 12	" "
189 <sup>a</sup>	XIII	19	Archiep. Salernit.	" " 23	" "
189 <sup>b</sup>	XIII	20	Regi Franc.	" " 29	" "
189 <sup>b</sup>	XIII	21	Melchiori. secret. Card. Sedun.,	1516 Ul- tima Sept.	" "
190 <sup>a</sup>	XIII	22	Regi Franc.	1516 Oct. 3	" "
190 <sup>a</sup>	—	—	Reatinis	" " 4	Missing.
190 <sup>b</sup>	XIII	23	Petro Navarrae	" " 5	Subst. ident., form dif.
190 <sup>b</sup>	—	—	March <sup>i</sup> Mantuae	" " 8	Missing.
191 <sup>a</sup>	XIII	24	Guil. Gallo medico	" Sept. 8	Subst. ident., form dif.
191 <sup>a</sup>	—	—	Regi Hispan.	" " 12	Missing.
191 <sup>b</sup>	—	—	Domino de Ceures	" " 13	" "
192 <sup>a</sup>	—	—	Domino de Lutrech	" " 14	" "
192 <sup>b</sup>	XIII	25	Domino de Lutrech	" " 15	Subst. ident., form dif.
193 <sup>a</sup>	XIII	26	Raphaeli Medici	" " 22	" "
193 <sup>a</sup>	XIII	27	Regi Castellae	" " 22	" "
193 <sup>b</sup>	—	—	Bapt. Sabello	" " 24	Missing.
194 <sup>a</sup>	XIII	28	Communitati Brixelli	" " 19	Subst. ident., form dif.
194 <sup>b</sup>	XIII	29	Card. Toletano	" Nov. 2	" "
195 <sup>a</sup>	XIII	30	Lud. Firmano et Hier. Brancadoriae	1516 Nov. 3	" "
195 <sup>b</sup>	XIII	31	Pallavicino de Pallavicinis	1516 Dec. 1	" "
195 <sup>b</sup>	XIII	33	Fucaris mercatoribus Germanis	" " 12	" "
196 <sup>a</sup>	XIII	35	Dom. de Lutrech	" " 23	" "
196 <sup>b</sup>	XIII	36	Ragusinis	1517 Jan. 3	" "
196 <sup>b</sup>	—	—	Domino de Lutrech	" " 16	Missing.
197 <sup>a</sup>	XIII	37	Ioa. Georgio Trissino	" " 17	Subst. ident., form dif.
197 <sup>a</sup>	—	—	Domino de Lutrech	" " 18	Missing.
197 <sup>b</sup>	—	—	Ep <sup>o</sup> Siracusano	" " 18	" "
197 <sup>b</sup>	XIV	3	Capitaneis Hispan.	" " 19	Subst. ident., form dif.
198 <sup>a</sup>	—	—	Domino de Cieures	" " 20	Missing.
198 <sup>b</sup>	XIV	4	Ep <sup>o</sup> Pacensi	" " 20	Subst. ident., form dif.
198 <sup>b</sup>	XIV	5	March. Mantuae	" " 21	" "
199 <sup>a</sup>	XIV	6	VIII viris Practicae Florent.	" " 21	" "
199 <sup>b</sup>	—	—	Duci Ferrariae	" " 26	Missing.



Codex P. 130.			Address and Date in Codex P. 130.		Cf. the printed ed.: Petri Bembi epistolae, Basileae, 1539.
Fol.	Lib.	Epist.			
200 <sup>a</sup>	XIV	7	Regi Franc.	1517 Jan. 28	Subst. ident., form dif.
200 <sup>b</sup>	XIV	8	Dom. de Ceures	" " 31	" " "
201 <sup>a</sup>	—	—	Regi Hispan.	" " 31	Missing.
201 <sup>b</sup>	—	—	Without inscription, probably also to the King of Spain	1517 Jan. 30	" " "
202 <sup>a</sup>	XIV	9	Magno Rhodi Magistro	" " 31	Subst. ident., form dif.
202 <sup>b</sup>	—	—	Imperatori	" Feb. 2	Missing.
203 <sup>b</sup>	XIV	10	Regi Hispan.	" Jan. 2	Subst. ident., form dif.
204 <sup>a</sup>	XIV	13	Card. Gurcensi	" Feb. 2	" " "
205 <sup>a</sup>	—	—	Dominae Margaritae de Austria	" " 2	Missing.
(In margin: in add. ch. 5.)					
205 <sup>a</sup>	—	—	Domino de Ceures	1517 Feb. 2	" "
205 <sup>b</sup>	—	—	Abbati S. Bertini	" " 2	" "
206 <sup>a</sup>	—	—	Electo Feltrensi nuntio	" " 2	" "
206 <sup>a</sup>	XIV	14	Regi Hispan.	" " 2	Subst. ident., form dif.
206 <sup>b</sup>	XIV	15	Viceregi Neapol.	" " 15	" " "
207 <sup>a</sup>	—	—	Viceregi Neapol.	1517 Ultima Febr.	Missing.
207 <sup>b</sup>	—	—	Blank.		
208 <sup>a</sup>	XV	3	Ep <sup>o</sup> Dertusensi	1518 [sic] Martii 20, a. V.	Subst. ident., form dif. (1517, a. quinto.)
208 <sup>a</sup>	—	—	Alfonso de S. Cruce	1518(7) " 24 "	Missing.
208 <sup>b</sup>	XV	4	Viceleg. Perusiae	1517 " 29 "	Subst. ident., form dif.
208 <sup>b</sup>	XV	5	Comiti Potentiae	" " 30 "	" " "
209 <sup>a</sup>	XV	8	Regi cathol.	" April 3 "	" " "
209 <sup>b</sup>	XV	12	Latino Iuvenali	" " 17 "	" " "
210 <sup>a</sup>	XV	11	Prosp. Columnae de Cavis	1517 April 26, a. V.	" " "
210 <sup>a</sup>	—	—	Viceregi Neapol.	1517 Maii 5 a. V.	Missing.
210 <sup>b</sup>	—	—	Comiti Potentiae	" " 8 "	" "
211 <sup>a</sup>	—	—	Duci Ferrariae	1518 [sic] " 13 "	" "
211 <sup>a</sup>	XV	19	Tudertinis	1517 " 14 "	Subst. ident., form dif.
211 <sup>b</sup>	XV	26	Petro Navarrae	" " 27 "	" " "
212 <sup>a</sup>	XV	27	Regi cathol.	" " 31 "	" " "
212 <sup>b</sup>	—	—	Regi cathol.	1517 Ultima Maii "	Missing.
213 <sup>a</sup>	—	—	Nuntiis apud Helvetios	1517 Junii 1 "	" "
213 <sup>a</sup>	XV	28	Prosp. Columnae de Cavis	" " 9 "	Subst. ident., form dif.
213 <sup>b</sup>	—	—	Dominis Ungaris	" " 16 "	Missing.
214 <sup>a</sup>	XV	40	Ioan. Iacobo Trivultio	" Julii 1 "	Subst. ident., form dif.
214 <sup>b</sup>	—	—	Magno Rhodi Magistro	" " 5 "	Missing.
215 <sup>a</sup>	XV	41	Viceleg. Perusiae	" " 5 "	Subst. ident., form dif.
215 <sup>b</sup>	—	—	Duci Gravinae	" " 9 "	Missing.
216 <sup>a</sup>	XV	43	Viceregi Neapol.	" " 14 "	Subst. ident., form dif.
216 <sup>a</sup>	XV	44	Helvetiis	" " 9 "	" " "
217 <sup>a</sup>	XV	45	Ductori in exercitu	" " 15 "	" " "
217 <sup>b</sup>	XV	46	Duci Ferrariae	" " 15 "	" " "
218 <sup>a</sup>	—	—	Viceregi Neapol.	" " 16 "	Missing.
218 <sup>a</sup>	—	—	Asculanis	" " 16 "	" "
218 <sup>b</sup>	—	—	Ugoni de Moncada viceregi	" " 17 "	" "
219 <sup>a</sup>	XV	47	Cardi Pisano	" " 21 "	Subst. ident., form dif.
219 <sup>a</sup>	XV	48	Famil. de Rodulfis	" " 22 "	" " "
219 <sup>b</sup>	XV	50	Io. Fr. Pico Mirand. comiti	1517 Aug. 27, a. V.	" " "

Codex P. 130.			Address and Date in Codex P. 130.		Cf. the printed ed.: Petri Bembi epistolae, Basileae, 1539.
Fol.	Lib.	Epist.			
220 <sup>a</sup>	XVI	2	Card. Pisano	1517 Nov. 11, a. V.	Subst. ident. form dif.
220 <sup>a</sup>	—	—	Regi Franciae	„ „ 12 „	Missing.
220 <sup>b</sup>	—	—	Domino de Lutrech	„ „ 12 „	„
220 <sup>b</sup>	XVI	3	Senatui Mediol.	„ Dec. 6 „	Subst. ident., form dif.
221 <sup>a</sup>	—	—	Thomae Spinello nuntio regio Angliae apud Cathol. M <sup>tem</sup>	1517 Dec. 14, a. V.	Missing.
221 <sup>b</sup>	XVI	4	Regi Catholico	1518 [sic] „ 26 „	Subst. ident., form dif. (Printed 1517.)
222 <sup>a</sup>	—	—	Domino de Ceures	1518 „ 26 „	Missing.
222 <sup>b</sup>	XVI	5	Ep <sup>o</sup> Ovetensi	„ „ 26 „	Subst. ident., form dif.
223 <sup>a</sup>	—	—	Regi christ <sup>mo</sup>	„ „ 30 „	Missing.
223 <sup>a</sup>	XVI	6	Domino de Lutrech	1518 Ultima Dec., „	Subst. ident., form dif. (Printed 1517.)
223 <sup>b</sup>	XVI	7	Lud. regi Ungariae	1518 Jan. 8 „	Subst. ident., form dif.
224 <sup>a</sup>	XVI	8	Viceregi Neapol.	„ „ 9 „	„ „
224 <sup>a</sup>	—	—	Viceregi Neapol.	„ „ 10 „	Missing.
224 <sup>b</sup>	XVI	9	Ep <sup>o</sup> Burgensi	„ „ 12 „	Subst. ident., form dif. (Printed, 1517.)
225 <sup>a</sup>	XVI	10	Regi christ <sup>mo</sup>	„ „ 17 „	Subst. ident., form dif.
225 <sup>a</sup>	XVI	11	Ioan. duci Albaniae	„ „ 18 „	„ „
225 <sup>b</sup>	XVI	12	Regi catholico	„ „ 25 „	„ „
226 <sup>a</sup>	—	—	Regi catholico	„ Febr. 6 „	Missing.
226 <sup>b</sup>	—	—	Domino de Cieures	„ „ 24 „	„
227 <sup>a</sup>	—	—	Regi christ <sup>mo</sup>	„ „ 24 „	„
227 <sup>a</sup>	—	—	Imperatorii	„ Martii 6 „	„
227 <sup>b</sup>	—	—	Reginae Ungar.	„ „ 6 „	„
227 <sup>b</sup>	—	—	Cardi Gurcensi	„ „ 6 „	„
228 <sup>a</sup>	—	—	Electo <sup>ribus</sup> imp. singulatim	„ „ 6 „	„
228 <sup>a</sup>	—	—	Iacobo Bannisio	„ „ 6 „	„
228 <sup>b</sup>	XVI	13	Regi cathol.	„ „ 11 „	Subst. ident., form dif.
228 <sup>b</sup>	XVI	15	Gubern. Bononiae	„ „ 11 „	„ „
229 <sup>a</sup>	XVI	16	Regi catholico	„ „ 15 „	„ „
229 <sup>b</sup>	XVI	14	Nuntio Venetiis	„ „ 18 „	„ „
230 <sup>a</sup>			Blank.		
230 <sup>b</sup>			„		
231 <sup>a</sup>			„		
231 <sup>b</sup>			„		
Now begins the older hand (see description of the Codex.) The notes on margin indicating the Book and the letter, in a later hand, the same which wrote the corresponding notes in the other part of the Codex.					
232 <sup>a</sup>	XVI	19	Regi christ <sup>mo</sup>	1518 Martii 19, a. VI.	Subst. ident., form dif.
233 <sup>a</sup>	XVI	20	Rhegi gubern.	„ Sept. 9 „	„ „
233 <sup>b</sup>	XVI	21	Duci Venet.	1519 Dec. 26, a. VI. [sic]	„ „
234 <sup>a</sup>	XVI	23	Mediol. ducissae	1520 Oct. 9, a. VIII.	„ „
234 <sup>b</sup>	XVI	24	Card. Dertusensi	1520 Oct. 22, a. IX. [sic]	„ „
235 <sup>b</sup>	—	—	Regi Portugalliae	1520 Oct. 29, a. VIII.	Missing.
(This letter is cancelled).					
236 <sup>a</sup>	XVI	25	Communit. Rhagusii	1520 Dec. 8, a. VIII.	Subst. ident., form dif.
236 <sup>b</sup>	—	—	Prospero Columnae	„ „ 14 „	Missing.
(Cancelled.)					

Codex P. 130.			Address and Date in Codex P. 130.	Cf. the printed ed.: Petri Bembi epistolae, Basileae, 1539.
Fol.	Lib.	Epist.		
237 <sup>a</sup>	—	—	Civitati Spoleti 1520 Jan. 6, a. VIII. (Cancelled.)	Missing.
237 <sup>b</sup>	XVI	26	Civitati Tuderti (cancelled, replaced by: Regi Franciae) 1520 Oct. 12	Subst. ident., form dif.
239 <sup>a</sup>	XVI	27	Matri Regis Loysiae Engolismensi ducissae 1520 Oct. 12	" (Very different.)
239 <sup>b</sup>	—	—	Philibertae de Sabaudia Nemorsi ducissae 1520 Oct. 12	Missing.
240 <sup>a</sup>	—	—	Duci Traiecti " " 16	"
240 <sup>b</sup>	—	—	Gubernat <sup>i</sup> et prioribus Spoleti " " 16	"
241 <sup>a</sup>	XVI	28	Nemorsi ducissae " " 4	Subst. ident., form very different.
			The older hand again continues (see description of the Codex.)	
242 <sup>a</sup>	—	—	Proregi Neapol. 1521 Febr. 1	Missing.
242 <sup>b</sup>	—	—	Regi Angliae " " 25	"
243 <sup>a</sup>	—	—	Card <sup>i</sup> Eboracen. " " 25	"
243 <sup>b</sup>	245 <sup>b</sup>		Blank.	
			The later hand again continues (see description of the Codex.)	
246 <sup>a</sup>	VIII	20	Duci Sabaudiae 1514 Apr. 6	Subst. ident., form dif.
246 <sup>b</sup>	—	—	Philibertae domicellae Sabaudiae " " 6	Missing.
247 <sup>a</sup>	—	—	Duci Sabaudiae " " 8	"
247 <sup>b</sup>	VIII	22	Comiti Genevens. " " 8	Subst. ident., form dif.
248 <sup>a</sup>	VIII	23	Regi Franciae " Junii 13	" "
248 <sup>b</sup>	VIII	31	Hannib. Paleotto " Julii 1	" "
249 <sup>a</sup>	VIII	9	David regi Abissinor " Nov. 8	In MS. wrong Book and Letter given; the letter corresponds to Book IX. ep. 414, in the published edition.
249 <sup>b</sup>	X	11	Vito Fursto " " 12	Subst. ident., form dif.
250 <sup>a</sup>	X	21	Imperatori 1515 Martii 8	" "
250 <sup>b</sup>	X	22	Nuntio in Germania " Maii 8	" "
253 <sup>a</sup>	X	40	Ludovico Areosto " Junii 20	" "
253 <sup>b</sup>	X	59	Duci Urbini " Aug. 16	" "
253 <sup>b</sup>	X	60	Marco Ant. Columnae " " 16	" "
254 <sup>a</sup>	X	61	Regi Franciae 1516 Aug. 26, a. IV.*	" "
255 <sup>a</sup>	—	—	Galeatio Pallavic. 1516 [sic] Penult. Aug. a. III. [sic]	Missing.
			(In margin: add ch. 4.)	
256 <sup>a</sup>	XI	1	Regi Franciae 1515 Sept. 28	Subst. ident., form dif.
256 <sup>b</sup>	XI	2	Magistro Franciae " " 28	" "
257 <sup>a</sup>	XI	3	Duci Sabaudiae " " 28	" "
257 <sup>b</sup>	XI	4	Iuliano Medici " Oct. 1	" "
258 <sup>a</sup>	XI	11	Legato Romae " Dec. 3	" "
258 <sup>b</sup>	XI	24	Imperatori 1516 Febr. 9	" "
260 <sup>a</sup>	XII	28	Regi Hispaniae " Junii 19	" "
260 <sup>b</sup>	—	—	Dominae Engolismensi " Aug. 24	Missing.
261 <sup>a</sup>	XIII	32	Galeatio Pallavicino " Nov. 29	Subst. ident., form dif.
262 <sup>a</sup>	XIII	33	March. Montisferrati " Dec. 7	" "
262 <sup>a</sup>	XIII	38	Regi Hispan. 1517 Jan. 10	" "
262 <sup>b</sup>	XIV	1	Duci Ferrariae " " 16	" "

\* In the printed edition of 1547: Anno tertio.

Codex P. 130.			Address and Date in Codex P. 130.	Cf. the printed ed.: Petri Bembi epistolae, Basileae, 1539.
Fol.	Lib.	Epist.		
263 <sup>a</sup>	—	—	Imperatorii 1517 Jan. 20	Missing.
263 <sup>b</sup>	XIV	17	Odoni Dom. de Lutrech „ Febr. 6	Subst. ident., form dif.
264 <sup>a</sup>	XIV	18	Regi Hispan. „ „ 17	„ „
264 <sup>b</sup>	XIV	19	Ep° Pacensi „ „ 17	„ „
265 <sup>a</sup>	XIV	20	Regi Hispan. „ „ 27	„ „
266 <sup>a</sup>	XIV	22	Regi Franciae „ Martii 8	„ „
266 <sup>b</sup>	—	—	Domino de Lutrech „ „ 8	Missing.
267 <sup>a</sup>	—	—	Ducissae Engolismensi „ „ 8	„ „
268 <sup>a</sup>	XIV	23	Duci Venet. „ „ 8	Subst. ident., form dif.
269 <sup>a</sup>	XIV	24	Duci Venet. „ „ 10	„ „
(In text, a few corrections in another hand.)				
269 <sup>b</sup>	XIV	25	Card. Senensi 1517 Martii 12	„ „
270 <sup>a</sup>	—	—	Prospero Columnae „ „ 12	Missing.
271 <sup>a</sup>	—	—	Ep° Sibiricensi nuntio in Gallia 1518 [sic] Martii 5	„ „
271 <sup>b</sup>	XV	2	Ep° Saguntino 1517 Martii 20	Subst. ident., form dif.
272 <sup>a</sup>	XV	7	Regi Hispan. „ Apr. 1	„ „
273 <sup>a</sup>	XV	9	Laur. Med. duci Urbin. „ „ 5	„ „
273 <sup>b</sup>	XV	10	Regi Franciae „ „ 5	„ „
274 <sup>a</sup>	XV	13	Ioan. de Berna Helvetio „ Maii 1	„ „
274 <sup>b</sup>	XV	14	Sebast. Ferrerio „ „ 1	„ „
274 <sup>b</sup>	XV	15	Amet Ben Jaye Ben Semumae in insula Zerbor. dom. 1517 Maii 11	„ „
275 <sup>a</sup>	XV	16	Comiti Potentiae „ „ 3	„ „
275 <sup>b</sup>	XV	18	Ioan. Paulo Balioni „ „ 14	„ „
276 <sup>b</sup>	—	—	Perusinis „ „ 14	Missing.
277 <sup>b</sup>	XV	21	Senensibus „ „ 15	Subst. ident., form dif.
278 <sup>b</sup>	XV	20	Ioan. P. Balioni „ „ 17	„ „
279 <sup>a</sup>	—	—	Gentili Balioni „ „ 17	Missing.
280 <sup>a</sup>	—	—	Domino de Cievres „ „ 17	„ „
280 <sup>b</sup>	XV	22	Ludov. Tudertino „ „ 18	Subst. ident., form dif.
281 <sup>b</sup>	XV	23	Regi Franciae „ „ 19	„ „
282 <sup>a</sup>	XV	24	Comiti Potentiae „ „ 22	„ „
282 <sup>b</sup>	XV	25	Domino de Sissa „ „ 22	„ „
283 <sup>a</sup>	—	—	Regi catholico „ „ 23	Missing.
284 <sup>a</sup>	—	—	Camillo Triultio „ „ 27	„ „
284 <sup>b</sup>	—	—	Ugoni de Moncada „ „ 31	„ „
285 <sup>a</sup>	—	—	Domino de Cievres 1517 Ultima Maii	„ „
285 <sup>b</sup>	XV	29	Dom. de Schissae „ „ „	Subst. ident., form dif.
286 <sup>a</sup>	XV	30	Vitello Tifernati „ „ „	„ „
287 <sup>a</sup>	XV	31	Helvetiis 1517 Junii 1	„ „
288 <sup>a</sup>	—	—	Dom. de Lutrech „ „ 5	Missing.
288 <sup>b</sup>	XV	33	Ep° Curiensi „ „ 5	Subst. ident., form dif.
289 <sup>a</sup>	XV	34	Generali Mediol. „ „ 6	„ „
289 <sup>b</sup>	XV	36	Viceregi Neapol. „ „ 19	„ „
290 <sup>a</sup>	—	—	Ioanni Iacobi Triultio „ „ 21	Missing.
290 <sup>b</sup>	XV	37	Nic. Scombergh ord. praedic. „ „ 21	Subst. ident., form dif.
291 <sup>b</sup>	—	—	Regi cathol. „ „ 21	Missing.
291 <sup>b</sup>	—	—	Duci Alvae „ Julii 3	„ „
292 <sup>b</sup>	XV	42	Sing. Cant. Helvet. „ „ 7	Subst. ident., form dif.
293 <sup>b</sup>	—	—	Ep° Curiensi „ „ 7	Missing.
293 <sup>b</sup>	—	—	Thomae Domino de Lescu „ „ 8	„ „



Codex P. 130			Address and Date in Codex P. 130.	Cf. the printed ed.: Petri Bembi epistolae, Basileae, 1539.
Fol.	Lib.	Epist.		
294 <sup>a</sup>	XV	49	Card S. Mariae in Porticu legato 1517 Aug. 8	Subst. ident., form dif. Missing.
294 <sup>b</sup>	—	—	Domino de Schissae 1517 „ 14	
295 <sup>a</sup>	—	—	Imperatori „ „ 20	Subst. ident., form dif.
296 <sup>a</sup>	XVI	1	Regi catholico „, Sept. 19	
296 <sup>b</sup>	—	—	Blank.	Missing.
297 <sup>a*</sup>	—	—	Regi chr <sup>mo</sup> 1521 Apr. 6 (Many corrections in another hand.)	
297 <sup>b</sup>	—	—	Blank. (Here follow 5 fly-leaves in the format of the older MS.)	

When we compare the handwriting of the Ambrosian MS. with Cod. Vatic. 3364, we arrive at the important result that f. 1-10<sup>b</sup> of the Cod. Vatic. are in exactly the same hand as that of the quinterni marked B in the description of the Milanese MS. In these quinterni we certainly have before us the Register which Latino Giovenale Manetti found in Bembo's possession, and which led him to urge his friend to publish the Leonine letters.

When the plan of publication was settled, Bembo proceeded to prepare a new MS. of the letters now preserved in the Cod. Vatic. 3364. Here, for purposes of style, Bembo introduced the corrections for the printers which have been specified above; in some cases alterations were made after the proof had been handed in,† so that of many letters there are five versions extant: (1) the Register in Cod. Ambros.; (2) the original composition; (3) the first version of the Cod. Vatic.; (4) the second version of the Cod. Vatic.; (5) published version.

If we look again at the concordance given above, we can have no hesitation in saying that in no single instance do the published letters "Leonis X., P.M. nomine scriptae" correspond exactly to the originals; no single piece agrees verbally with the Cod. Ambros.: all are more or less thoroughly revised, but only as regards their style, the substance of the letters having undergone no important alteration. Bembo's Latin letters therefore can

\* Pages numbered in pencil.

† Cf. *supra*, p. 488, the notes on letter to the Doge.

never be used, in the published form of the "Epistolae," for the purpose of extracting the exact phraseology of the originals. To do this we must have recourse to the originals themselves, or where they are not to be found, to the Cod. Ambros. On the other hand, the text of the "Epistolae" can be substantially relied upon as a source of historical information, so far as the main contents of the former (the regesta) are concerned. For points of detail the printed editions should not be used; the Cod. Ambros. is the authority in such cases. This can be proved, among other examples, by a comparison of the famous letter to Raphael of the 27th of August 1515 (see *supra*, p. 373), as printed with the version in the Cod. Ambros.

COD. AMBROS., FOL. 149, LIB. X.,  
EPIST. 51.

Raphaello Urbinati.

Cum ad Romanum Principis Apostolorum templum exaedificandum, cui plane operi omnem curam diligentiamque nostram adhibemus, maxime intersit, ut lapidum marmorisque materia, qua abundare nos oportet, domi potius habeatur, quam peregre advehatur: exploratum autem nobis sit magnam eius rei copiam Urbis ruinas suppeditare, effodique passim omnis generis saxa fere ab universis, qui Romae quique etiam prope Romam aedificare aliquid vel omnino terram vertere parumper moliuntur: te, quo architecto eius templi operisque magistro utimur, cuiusque tum virtutem et probitatem, tum vero maxime in nos sedemque hanc apostolicam reverentiam et multum saepenumero et perspeximus et probavimus, marmorum et lapidum omnium omnisque generis qui Romae quique extra Romam denum milium passuum spatio deinceps eruentur, praefectum constituimus, ea de causa, ut quae ad eius templi aedificationem erunt oportuna, ea honesto precio nostro nomine emas. Mandantes omnibus hominibus, mediocribus, summis, infimis, quae deinceps marmora

BEMBI EPIST. LEONIS X., LIB. X.,  
N. 51.

Raphaello Urbinati.

Cum ad principis Apostolorum phanum Romanum exaedificandum maxime intersit, ut lapidum marmorisque copia, qua abundare nos oportet, domi potius habeatur, quam peregre advehatur: exploratum autem mihi sit magnam eius rei facultatem Urbis ruinas suppeditare, effodique passim omnis generis saxa fere ab omnibus, qui Romae quique etiam prope Romam aedificare aliquid vel omnino terram vertere parumper moliuntur: te, quo magistro eius aedificationis utor, marmorum et lapidum omnium, qui Romae quique extra Romam denum millium passuum spacio posthac eruentur, praefectum facio ea de causa, ut quae ad eius phani aedificationem idonea erunt, mihi emas. Quare mando omnibus hominibus, mediocribus, summis, infimis, quae posthac marmora quaeque saxa omnis generis intra eum [sic],\* quem dixi, loci spacium eruent effodient, ut te earum rerum praefectum de singulis erutis effossive quamprimum certiores faciant.

\* In the Basle ed. of 1547: eius.

saxaque omnis generis intra eum [sic], quem diximus, loci spatium effodient, ut te earum rerum praefectum de singulis erutis effossisque quamprimum certiore faciant; qui id triduo non fecerit, volumus, ut excommunicationis latae sententiae, a qua per neminem nisi per nos absolvi possit, et centum ducatorum auri qui minima, qui vero ad summum, mille, caeterum nostro arbitrio imponenda poena inter haec extrema mulctetur, eumque mulctandum sine alio decreto nostro iam nunc decernimus et declaramus. Praeterea quoniam certiores etiam facti sumus, multum antiqui marmoris et saxi, litteris monumentisque incisi, quae quidem saepe monumenta notam aliquam egregiam prae se ferunt quaeque servari opere precium esset ad cultum litterarum Romanique sermonis elegantiam excolendam, a fabris marmorariis eo pro materia utentibus temere secari, ita, ut inscriptiones aboleantur, mandamus omnibus, qui caedendi marmoris artem Romae exercent, sub eisdem poenis, ut sine tuo iussu et concessione lapidem ullum inscriptum caedere secareve non audeant.

Datum Romae XXVII augusti 1515  
Anno III.

Id qui triduo non fecerit, ei a centum usque ad tercentum [sic] numum aureorum, quae tibi videbitur, mulcta esto. Praeterea quoniam certior sum factus multum antiqui marmoris et saxi, litteris monumentisque incisi, quae quidem saepe monumenta notam aliquam egregiam prae se ferunt, quaeque servari operae precium esset ad cultum litterarum Romanique sermonis elegantiam excolendam, a fabris marmorariis eo pro materia utentibus temere secari, ita, ut inscriptiones aboleantur: mando omnibus, qui caedendi marmoris artem Romae exercent, ut sine tuo iussu aut permissu lapidem ullum inscriptum caedere secareve ne audeant: eadem illi mulcta adhibita, qui secus atque iubeo fecerit.

Dat.\* sexto cal. sept. anno tertio.  
Roma [sic].

\* In the Basle ed. of 1547, continuation missing.





## INDEX OF NAMES IN VOL. VIII.

- AARON, Pietro (musician),  
148 n.
- Acciaiuoli, Roberto, 108.
- „ Zanolì, 214, 265.
- Accolti, Bernardo, 149, 195,  
217 *seq.*
- „ Pietro, Cardinal, 415.
- Accursio, Mariangelo, 92 n.,  
217 n.
- Acuña, Antonio de (Bishop of  
Zamora), 19.
- Adorni, Family of the, 42.
- Adorno, Girolamo, 35, 36.
- Adrian of Utrecht (afterwards  
Pope Adrian VI.), Cardinal,  
257, 275 n., 376, 458.
- Ægidius of Viterbo, *see* Canisio.
- Aelst, Peter van, 295, 303.
- Africanus, Leo, 251 n.
- Alamanni, Family of the, 105.
- Albertini, Francesco (Canon),  
243.
- Albizzi, Family of the, 105.
- „ Antonio de', 399.
- „ Hieron. de' [Albicis],  
107 n.
- Albert of Brandenburg, Cardinal  
(Archbishop of Mayence),  
20, 27 n., 28, 267 n., 458.
- Aldus Manutius, 184, 257 *seq.*
- Aleander, Hieronymus, 20-25,  
26 *seqq.*, 31 n., 32 n., 37-  
39, 87, 255, 257, 265, 412.
- Alexander VI., Pope, 68, 103,  
122, 129, 459.
- Alfonso I., Duke of Ferrara,  
2 *seq.*, 10, 12, 35,
- Alfonso I.,—*continued.*  
41, 44, 51 *seq.*, 66,  
75 n., 160 n., 241  
n., 466.
- „ (Infant of Portu-  
gal), Cardinal,  
411 n., 436, 458.
- Alidosi, Francesco, Cardinal,  
165.
- Alteriori, Giulio, 131.
- Altieri, Marc Antonio, 116 n.,  
128.
- Altoviti, Bindo, 120 *seq.*
- Ami, Domenico (sculptor), 352.
- Ammonius, Andreas (Nuncio),  
254.
- d'Amorotto, Domenico, 43 n.
- Andrea da Ferrara, 41.
- Andreasia, Osanna, 224 n.,  
446 n.
- Angelico da Fiesole, Fra, 79.
- Antico, Andrea (musician),  
148 n.
- Antonino, S. (Archbishop of  
Florence), 445, 446 n.
- Antonio de Beatis, 295 n., 473.
- „ da Spello, 68.
- Aperbachius, Petrus, 216.
- Apostolios, *see* Arsenio.
- Apulejus, 119.
- Aquila, Juan del, *see* Branconio.
- Aragon, Isabella of, 83 n.
- „ Julia of, 83 n.
- d'Aragona, Luigi, Cardinal,  
113 *seq.*, 129, 144 n., 149,  
159, 161, 218, 295, 411 n.,  
473 n.

- Arcangelo (Archangiolo) da  
Siena, 74 n., 274.  
Arcimboldi, Angelo, 266.  
„ Antonelli, 452 n.  
„ Giovanni Maria,  
450-452.  
Ardinghello, Pietro, 107.  
Areniti, Costantino, *see* Com-  
nenus.  
Aretino, Cristoforo, 273 *seq.*  
„ Pietro, 118, 218, 234 n.  
Ariosto, Lodovico, 8, 77, 103,  
114, 125, 171 *seq.*, 220, 340.  
Armellini, Francesco, Cardinal,  
6, 92, 98 *seqq.*, 115, 129,  
458.  
Arsenio Apostolios, 260.  
Arsilli, Francesco, 190, 196,  
212 n., 216.  
Augurelli, Giovanni Aurelio,  
185 n.  
d'Avalos, Ferrante (Marquis of  
Pescara), 45, 52, 55.  
Averroës, 389.  
Aversa, Mathias, 470.
- BAGLIONI, Gentile, 6, 8.  
„ Giampaolo, 5-7, 8 n.,  
84, 161 n., 174 n.,  
478, 479.  
„ Malatesta, 6.  
Bainbridge, Christopher, Cardi-  
nal, 439.  
Bandinelli, Baccio, 69, 351 *seq.*  
Baraballo (of Gaeta), 106, 154  
*seq.*  
Barile, Giovanni, 318, 353, 364.  
Barme, Roger de, 418.  
Bartholini, Leonardo di Zanobi,  
94 n.  
Bartoli, Pietro Santi, 331 n.  
Bartolommeo, Fra, 152, 342.  
Battiferri, Giannantonio, 130.  
Beazzano, Agostino, 192, 218,  
266.  
Begnius, Simon (Bishop of  
Modrussa), 385.
- Bellanti, Andrea, 95 n.  
Belli, Valerio, 356.  
Bellini, The (painters), 193.  
Bembo, Pietro, 80 n., 105,  
113 n., 118, 136, 140, 184,  
190 *seqq.*, 193-197, 215,  
217, 228 *seqq.*, 233, 242,  
259, 276 n., 340, 467, 482  
*seqq.*  
Benassao, Latino [Beneassai],  
104.  
Beneti, Cipriano, 399.  
Benigno, Cornelio, 118.  
Benintendi, Antonio Dolphino,  
272 n.  
Benizi, *see* Filippo.  
Beroaldo, Filippo, 106, 264  
*seq.*, 268 *seq.*, 272 n., 274.  
Bibbiena, Barthol., 107 n.  
„ (Bernardo Dovizi),  
Cardinal, 6, 10, 12,  
14, 77, 87, 89, 91,  
104, 107, 110 *seqq.*,  
136, 139 *seq.*, 171,  
193, 195 *seq.*, 215,  
218, 224, 242, 288,  
332, 345, 376 n.,  
430, 457.  
„ Nicolaus, 107 n.  
„ Pietro, 107.  
Bini, The (bankers), 101, 120.  
Biondo, Paolo, 470.  
Bobadilla, Franc. de, (Bishop  
of Salamanca), 406.  
Boccamazzo, Domenico, 159.  
Boissy, Adrien Gouffier de,  
Cardinal, 10, 429 n., 458.  
Boleyn, Anne, 443.  
Bolzani, *see* Valeriano.  
Bonafede, Niccolò (Bishop of  
Chiusi), 4, 5.  
Bonaventura, Fra, 449.  
Boniface IV., Pope, 341  
„ VIII., Pope, 68 n.,  
134, 424.  
Borgati (architect), 354 n.,  
359 n.

- Borgia, Cesare, 4.  
 „ H., 67 n.  
 Boscoli, The, 236.  
 Botticella, Girolamo (jurist),  
 273 *seq.*  
 Bourbon, Charles, Duke of,  
 (The Constable),  
 298.  
 „ Louis de, Cardinal,  
 458.  
 Bramante, Donato, 130 n., 152,  
 293, 313 n., 317, 358–361,  
 365 *seq.*, 367 n., 370, 382.  
 Branconio del Aquila, Giovanni  
 Battistæ, 115, 130, 346,  
 370, 376 n.  
 Brandenburg, The Elector of,  
*see* Joachim I.  
 Brandino, 122, 152 n.  
 Brandolini Lippi, Raffaello, 106,  
 149, 222, 274, 275 n.  
 Brigotti, Febo, 130.  
 Brittonio, Girolamo, 153 n.  
 Brunelleschi, Filippo, 349.  
 Bruno, Cola, 194.  
 Budæus, Guilielmus, 229.  
 Bugiardini, 72 n.  
 Buglioni, Benedetto de', 353 n.  
 „ Francesco de' (sculp-  
 tor), 353.  
 CAJETAN (Thomas de Vio),  
 Cardinal, 252 *seq.*, 390, 458.  
 Calcagnini, Celio, 247 n., 248.  
 Calcondila, Basilio, 273 *seq.*  
 Calixtus III., Pope, 103, 338.  
 Calliergi, Zaccaria (printer),  
 262.  
 Calvo, Mario Fabio, 244, 247,  
 248 n.  
 Camelio, *see* Gambello.  
 Campani, Niccolò [Strascino],  
 149.  
 Campeggio, Lorenzo, Cardinal,  
 13 n., 441, 458.  
 Canisio, Egidio, Cardinal, 227,  
 250 *seq.*, 290, 393 *seq.*, 458.  
 Canossa, Lodovico di (Bishop  
 of Bayeux), 91 n., 433.  
 Capella, Bernardino (poet), 211.  
 Capistrano, Giovanni, S., 445.  
 Capodiferro, Evangelista Fausto  
 Maddaleni de', 212, 239 n.  
 Capponi, Family of the, 105.  
 Caracciolo, M., 25 n., 27 *seq.*  
 Caradosso, Ambrogio, 140, 355,  
 356.  
 Carafa, Gian Pietro (Bishop of  
 Chieti, afterwards Pope  
 Paul IV.), 385. *See* Paul  
 IV.  
 Caravaggio, Polidoro da, 152,  
 322, 326 n.  
 Cardona (Viceroy of Naples),  
 34.  
 Carlstadt, 453.  
 Carondolet, Ferry de, 115.  
 Carpi, Count of, *see* Pio.  
 Carvajal, Bernardino Lopez de,  
 Cardinal, 137.  
 Casali, Battista (poet), 211, 212  
 n., 227 *seq.*  
 Casanova, Marcantonio, 213.  
 Casio, G. (poet), 217 n.  
 Castellesi, Adriano, Cardinal,  
 129 *seqq.*, 441.  
 Castiglione, Baldassare, 43, 47,  
 50, 56 *seqq.*, 65, 67, 86 n.,  
 87 n., 113, 139 *seq.*, 148,  
 176, 190, 195, 231, 242,  
 245, 249, 318, 322, 340,  
 364, 371, 475 *seq.*, 479 *seq.*  
 Catacuzeno, 83.  
 Catarino, Ambrogio, 24, 252.  
 Cellini, Benvenuto, 121, 355.  
 Cenci, Family of the, 131.  
 Centurione, Paoletto, 448 n.  
 Cerretani, Bartolomeo, 179 *seq.*,  
 181.  
 Cesarini, Alessandro, Cardinal,  
 457.  
 „ Joanzorzo, 477.  
 Cesi, Family of the, 129.  
 „ Angelo, 478, 479.

- Cesi, Paolo Emilio, Cardinal,  
     450, 457.  
 Charlemagne, 288, 290 *seq.*  
 Charles V. (The Emperor), 1,  
     3, 8 *seq.*, 11-27,  
     28-38, 41, 44,  
     46 *seq.*, 49 *seq.*,  
     53, 56 *seq.*, 65  
     n., 85, 108, 111,  
     138 *seq.*, 405, 409,  
     481.  
     ,, VIII. (King of France),  
         239.  
     ,, I. (Duke of Savoy),  
         410 n.  
 Chiericati, Francesco, 446 n.  
 Chièvres, *see* Croy.  
 Chigi, Agostino, 116 *seqq.*, 195  
     *seq.*, 332, 343 *seq.*,  
     355, 361, 470, 478.  
     ,, Sigismondo, 100 n.  
 Chios, The Bishop of, 423.  
 Chiusi, The Bishop of, *see*  
     Bonafede.  
 Christian II. (King of Den-  
     mark), 39, 267 n., 451-  
     454.  
 Christina (Queen of Sweden),  
     156 n.  
 Ciarla, Simone, 283, 361.  
 Cibo, Caterina, 109.  
     ,, Eleonora, 109.  
     ,, Franceschetto, 109.  
     ,, Giovan Battista (Bishop  
         of Marseilles), 109.  
     ,, Innocenzo, Cardinal, 69  
         n., 88, 98, 109, 113,  
         114 n., 122, 171, 173,  
         358, 376 n., 458.  
     ,, Ippolita, 109.  
     ,, Lorenzo, 109.  
 Cinotto, 153 n.  
 Ciocchi del Monte, Antonio,  
     (of Sansovino), Cardinal,  
     271 n.  
 Ciolek, Erasmus Vitellius  
     (Bishop of Plock), 438.
- Clement VII., Pope, 69 n., 127,  
     131, 178, 209,  
     244, 252, 303,  
     332, 352, 376,  
     439, 449, *see*  
     Medici, Giulio  
     de'.  
     ,, XII., Pope, 374.  
 Clerk, Dr. J., 47, 67, 442, 444.  
 Colet, John, 440.  
 Colocci, Angelo, 185, 189, 260.  
 Cologne, The Elector of, *see*  
     Wied.  
 Colonna, Family of the, 480.  
     ,, Pietro [Galatino],  
         252 n.  
     ,, Pompeo, Cardinal,  
         241 n., 457.  
     ,, Prospero, 45, 52, 55,  
         159 n.  
     ,, Vittoria, 45.  
 Comnenus, Costantino Areneti  
     (Duke of Achaia), 83.  
 Conti, Francesco, Cardinal, 457.  
 Cornaro, Marco, Cardinal,  
     113 *seq.*, 162.  
 Corsi, Giovanni, 108.  
 Cortese, G., 386 n.  
 Corvino, Massimo (Bishop of  
     Isernia), 407, 422.  
 Croy, Guillaume de (Lord of  
     Chièvres), 28, 29 n.  
 Croy, Guillaume de, Cardinal,  
     458.  
 Cunsel, Joannes, 470.  
 Cupis, Giandomenico de, Cardi-  
     nal, 457.  
 Cusa, Nicholas of, Cardinal,  
     389.
- DANTE, 180.  
 David III. (Emperor of  
     Æthiopia), 403.  
 Decio Filippo, 273 n.  
 Denmark, King of, *see* Christian  
     II.



- Devonshire, The Duke of, 72.  
 Diaceto, Francesco, 250 n.  
 Dolciati, Antonio, 399.  
 Domenico de Sutri, 355.  
 Donatello, 288 n.  
 Dovizi, Bernardo, *see* Bibbiena.  
 Du Prat, Antoine Bohier, Cardinal, 415, 417, 418, 426, *seqq.*, 458.  
 Dürer, Albert, 283, 288, 324.
- ECKEN, Johann von der, 32.  
 Edme, Dom (Abbot), 135 n., 137 n.  
 Eliesen, Paul, 451.  
 Emmanuel the Great (King of Portugal), 39 n., 48, 154, 166, 187, 212, 228 n., 368 n., 435 *seq.*, 443 n.  
 Encina, Juan de la (musician), 148 n.  
 Enckenvoirt, Wilhelm von, 411 n.  
 Equicola, Mario, 224.  
 Erasmus, Desiderius, 140, 186, 189, 224, 229, 232 *seq.*, 253-256, 257.  
 Ercolano, Matteo, 227, 274 n.  
 d'Este, Ippolito, Cardinal, 113 *seq.*  
 „ Isabella (wife of Francesco Gonzaga, Marquis of Mantua), 169 n., 171, 173 n., 218, 318, 437, 473, 476, 478.  
 Eugenius IV., Pope, 272.
- FABBRI, Antonio de' (of San Marino) 355.  
 Fabriano, The Lord of, 5.  
 Farnese, Alessandro (afterwards Pope Paul III.), Cardinal, 117 n., 157 *seq.*, 160 n., 163, 465, *see* Paul III.
- Favorino, Varino, 262 *seq.*  
 Ferdinand the Catholic (King of Aragon), 447.  
 Ferreri, Bonifacio, Cardinal, 458.  
 „ Giambattista, 274.  
 „ Zaccaria, 106, 208-211, 448.  
 Festa, Costanzo (musician), 147 n.  
 Fiandino, Ambrogio (O.S.A.), 251 *seq.*  
 Filippo Benizi, S., 445.  
 Filonardi, Ennio, 50 *seq.*, 52.  
 Fisher, John, Bl. (Bishop of Rochester), 442.  
 Flaminio, Marc Antonio, 190, 191 n.  
 Foix, Odet de, *see* Lautrec.  
 „ Thomas de, *see* Lescun.  
 Fracastoro, Girolamo, 204 *seq.*  
 Francesco da Ferrara, 160 n., 475.  
 „ de Paula, S., 446.  
 „ de Potentia (Bishop of Skara), 454.  
 Francia, Francesco (painter) 116.  
 Franciabigio, Marcantonio (painter), 343.  
 Francis I. (King of France), 1, 3, 8-16, 17, 19, 35, 39, 41, 44, 46, 49, 56, 69, 85, 111, 139, 219, 260, 288, 290 *seq.*, 342, 375, 414-422, 425-429, 434, 470.  
 Frederick of Aragon (King of Sicily), 83 n.  
 „ the Wise (Elector of Saxony), 18, 20, 38, 453, 479.  
 Froben (printer), 256.  
 Fugger, Family of the, 120, 331 n., 356 n.  
 Fulvio, Andrea, 184 n., 243 *seqq.*, 247, 248 n.

- GABBIONETA, Alessandro, 77 n., 470.  
 Gaddi, Family of the, 101, 105.  
 „ (the banker) 120.  
 „ Niccolò, Cardinal, 69 n.  
 Gaetani, Family of the, 101.  
 „ Camillo, 101 n.  
 Gallo, Egidio (poet), 211.  
 Gambara, Giacomo da', 53, 480.  
 Gambello, Vittore [Camelio], 356.  
 Garcia, Alphonso (Abbat), 266 n.  
 Gattinara, Mercurino di, 29 n.  
 Gazoldo, Giovanni, 153 n., 156, 272 n., 275 n.  
 Genet, Eleazar (musician), 147 n.  
 George (Duke of Saxony), 27 n., 384.  
 Gerardini, Alessandro (Bishop of S. Domingo), 402.  
 Germanello, Angelo, 6-9 n., 88 n., 170 n., 476, 478.  
 Gerona, Saturno, 216 n.  
 Gheri [Gherio, Ghersio], Goro (Bishop of Pistoia), 108.  
 Gheri, Lorenzo, 116.  
 Ghinucci, Girolamo (Bishop of Ascoli), 423.  
 Ghisi, Aug., *see* Chigi.  
 Giacomo di Bartolomeo da Brescia, 75 n., 106 n., 130.  
 Giammaria [Medici] (a Jewish musician), 146.  
 Giberti, Gian Matteo (Bishop of Verona), 32 n., 59, 115 *seq.*, 142, 199, 228.  
 Gigli, Silvestro (Bishop of Worcester), 13 n., 439.  
 Giocondo da Verona, Fra, 140, 243, 245, 360, 361 n., 362, 364, 366.  
 Giorgi, Marino, 75 *seq.*, 95, 99, 102.  
 Giovanni da Udine, 119, 137 n., 282, 321 *seqq.*, 325-328, 345, 372.  
 Giovanni da Verona, Fra, 354.  
 Giovio [Jovius] Paolo, 67, 71, 76, 81 n., 90, 118, 128, 140 *seq.*, 150, 155 *seq.*, 161, 190, 223, 227, 238-241, 274, 276, 343, 460.  
 Giraldi, Giglio Gregorio, 190.  
 Gisors, The Lord of, 34.  
 Giulio Romano, 115, 119, 131, 282, 287, 294, 321, 337, 345, 372.  
 Giunta (printer), 259 n.  
 Giustiniani, Lorenzo, St., 445.  
 Glapion, 22, 32.  
 Gnesen, Archbishop of, *see* Laski.  
 Goethe, 298, 315 n.  
 Gonzaga, Federigo (Marquis of Mantua), 4, 45, 297, 475 *seq.*, 478 *seq.*  
 „ Francesco (Marquis of Mantua), 45 n., 54 n., 55, 160 n., 470, 479 *seq.*  
 „ Isabella, *see* Este, Isabella.  
 „ Sigismondo, Cardinal, 113, 114 n.  
 Goritz, Johann, 115 *seq.*, 189, 216.  
 Gradenigo, Luigi, 35 n., 44, 64 n., 71 n., 87 n., 97, 102.  
 Grana, Lorenzo (poet), 211, 212 n., 227.  
 Grassis, Paris de, 61, 64 n., 75, 78, 162, 223 n., 224, 296, 359, 367, 391, 422, 425.  
 Gratia de Francia, Fra, 457 n.  
 Gregory XVI., Pope, 299.  
 Greiffenclau, Richard von (Elector of Treves), 20.  
 Grimani, Domenico (Patriarch of Aquileia), Cardinal, 405, 408.  
 Guicciardini, Francesco, 43, 45, 54, 65 n., 67, 76, 81 n., 107, 179, 236, 369 n., 460.

- HENRY VIII. (King of England), 40, 48 n., 254, 439-444.  
 Heitmers, Johann, 266 *seqq.*, 471.  
 Herculanus, Matth., 81 n., 150 n.  
 Hochstraten, Jakob, 270.  
 Humelberg, Michael, 216.  
 Hutten, Ulrich von, 20, 177, 216, 270 n.
- IMOLA, Bishop of, *see* Scriboni.  
 Imperia, 122.  
 Inghirami, Tommaso, 140, 169, 227, 263 *seq.*, 274, 385.  
 Innocent VIII., Pope, 165, 434, 456.  
 Isaac (Hebreus de Phano), 75 n.  
 Isernia, Bishop of, *see* Corvino.
- JACOBazzi, Domenico, Cardinal, 423, 457.  
 Joachim I. (Elector of Brandenburg), 27 n., 28, 29 n.  
 Jovius, *see* Giovio.  
 Julius II., Pope, 2, 84, 90 *seq.*, 96, 99, 102, 116, 122, 165, 170, 183, 185 *seq.*, 191 199, 208, 212, 221, 224, 234, 252, 264 *seq.*, 276, 277 n., 282 *seq.*, 285, 296, 319, 330, 342, 348, *seqq.*, 355 *seq.*, 369, 374-378, 380 *seqq.*, 384, 424, 431, 447, 456.  
 „ III., Pope, 298.
- KRAIN, The Bishop of, 409.
- LAMPRIDIO, Benedetto, 213 n., 260.  
 Lancelloti, Scipione (poet), 211, 274.  
 Lapi, Basilio, 399.
- Lascaris, Giano, 140, 184, 256 *seqq.*  
 Laski, Joannes de (Archbishop of Gnesen), 403, 437 *seq.*  
 Lattes, Bonet de, 75 n.  
 Lautrec, Odet de Foix, Vicomte de, 35, 42 n., 52 n., 54 *seq.*  
 Lelio, Antonio (poet), 211, 212 n., 234 n.  
 Lenno, Giuliano, 367 n.  
 Leo III., Pope, 285, 288 *seq.*, 291.  
 „ IV., Pope, 285, 287, 289.  
 „ X., Pope, 1-6, 9-16, 17-37, 39, 41, 43-53, 56-92, 95-118, 122, 126, 128 *seq.*, 131 *seq.*, 134, 136-140, 142-145, 147-167, 169-181, 185-189, 191-198, 200 *seq.*, 203-205, 207 *seqq.*, 212 *seqq.*, 218-225, 227, 230-248, 250-281, 283, 285-287, 289-297, 299, 303 *seq.*, 316-320, 325, 328-332, 338 *seq.*, 341 *seqq.*, 345 *seq.*, 348 *seq.*, 351-360, 362, 365 *seqq.*, 373-388, 390 *seq.*, 394-399, 401 *seqq.*, 405, 408 *seq.*, 411 *seq.*, 414-428, 430 *seqq.*, 434-450, 454-461, 465-471, 473, 475, 480, 482 *seqq.*  
 „ XIII., Pope, 299 n.
- Leo Africanus, *see* Africanus.  
 Le Roy, Thomas [Regis], 115.  
 Lescun, Thomas de Foix, Vicomte de, 42, 46, 481.  
 Leto, Pomponio, 212.  
 Lippi, Raffaello Brandolini, *see* Brandolini.  
 Lombardi, Alfonso, 69 n., 73 n.

- Lombardo, Girolamo, 352.  
 Longueil [Longolius], Christ.,  
     228-233.  
 Lorenzetto, 340, 352.  
 Lorraine, Jean de, Cardinal,  
     458, 474.  
 Louis XI. (King of France),  
     295, 424.  
 Louisa of Savoy, 417.  
 Luther, Martin, 1, 18, 21-30,  
     31 n., 37-40, 88, 174, 177-  
     181, 201, 230, 233 *seq.*,  
     252, 256, 413, 441 *seq.*,  
     450, 453, 479.  
 MACHIAVELLI, 236 *seqq.*  
 Maddaleni de' Capodiferro, *see*  
     Capodiferro.  
 Malaspina, Bernabò, 66.  
     ,, Ricciarda, 109.  
 Maleguccio, Annibale, 103.  
 Mammacino, Romolo, 265,  
     443 n.  
 Manetti, Latino Giovenale, 194,  
     242, 509.  
 Mantegna, Andrea, 193.  
 Mantovano, Battista Spagnolo,  
     123 n., 204-207.  
 Mantua, Marquis of, *see*  
     Gonzaga.  
 Manuel, Juan, 8 *seq.*, 13 n.,  
     15, 17-19, 21, 24, 25 n.,  
     26 *seq.*, 29 *seq.*, 33-35, 67  
     n., 479.  
 Manutius, *see* Aldus.  
 Marcello, Cristoforo (Arch-  
     bishop of Corfu), 252,  
     271 n., 446 n.  
 Marchese, Cassandra, 203.  
 Marck, Robert de la, 41.  
 Mariano, Fra, 64 n., 122, 151  
     *seq.*, 171, 342.  
 Mario da Volterra (Bishop of  
     Aquino), 197 n.  
 Mark, Eberhard de la, Cardinal  
     (Bishop of Liège), 11 *seqq.*,  
     19, 47, 458.  
 Marone, Andrea, 149 *seq.*  
 Martin V., Pope, 332.  
 Martinelli, Biagio di Barone,  
     98 n.  
 Masaccio (painter), 313.  
 Matthias (Bishop of Strengnäs),  
     453.  
 Maximilian I. (The Emperor),  
     20, 65 n., 215 n., 219.  
 Mayence, The Elector of, *see*  
     Albert.  
 Mazocchi, Jacopo (printer), 242  
     *seq.*  
 Mazzolini, Silvestro, *see* Prierias.  
 Medici, Family of the, 36, 67,  
     68, 116, 156, 178,  
     236, 253.  
     ,, Alessandro de', 243.  
     ,, Caterina de', 10, 108.  
     ,, Contessina de', 109,  
         110.  
     ,, Giovanni de', 4, 45,  
         84.  
     ,, Giuliano de', 76, 80 n.,  
         84, 91, 108, 167 *seq.*,  
         225, 237, 341 *seq.*,  
         376.  
     ,, Giulio de' (afterwards  
         Pope Clement VII.),  
         Cardinal, 9, 11, 14,  
         21 *seq.*, 25 *seq.*, 28,  
         32 n., 35, 37, 45,  
         52 *seq.*, 55, 57-59,  
         61 *seqq.*, 65 n., 66,  
         74, 81 n., 87 *seq.*,  
         107, 111, 127 n.,  
         136, 142, 195, 215,  
         218, 233, 237 *seq.*,  
         250 n., 257, 265,  
         288, 335, 338, 344,  
         349 *seqq.*, 370, 372,  
         376, 411, 412 n.,  
         418, 425, 450, 457,  
         476, 479, 480, *see*  
         Clement VII.  
     ,, Ippolito de', 69 n.,  
         243.



- Medici, Lorenzo de' [The Magnificent], 84, 110, 183 *seq.*, 259, 349, 376.
- „ Lorenzo de' (Duke of Urbino), 3, 80 n., 98, 108, 116, 167 *seq.*, 237, 333, 376, 473.
- „ Lucrezia de' (wife of Jacopo Salviati), 63, 64 n., 69 n., 109.
- „ Maddalena de' (wife of Franceschetto Cibo), 109, 369.
- „ Piero de', 84.
- „ Raffaello de', 15, 27, 30, 32 *seq.*, 35, 108, 450.
- Mellini, Family of the, 212.
- „ Celso, 212, 225 n., 229, 231 *seq.*
- Memlinc, Hans, 192.
- Michael Angelo, 69 n., 73 n., 121, 136, 139 *seq.*, 298, 313 n., 315 *seq.*, 324, 340, 342-347, 348-352, 359 n., 379, 381.
- Michelozzi, Family of the, 105.
- Michiel, Marcantonio, 249, 296, 319, 322, 341.
- Middelburg, Paul von, 398.
- Minio, Marco (Venetian envoy), 76, 87 n., 89 n., 103, 405 *seq.*
- Mirandola, *see* Pico.
- Modesto, Francesco, 189 n.
- Molza, Francesco Maria, 213 n., 217.
- Monte, Cardinal, *see* Ciocchi.
- Montefeltro, Guidobaldo da, 173 n.
- Montelupo, Raffaello da, 70, 116 n., 352.
- Montesdoch, Juan, 250 n., 466.
- Morea, Despot of the, 168.
- Morette, 15.
- Morone, Girolamo, 42, 470.
- Morosina, 192 n.
- Mosca, Simone, 352.
- “Musicians,” 145 n. *seqq.*
- Musurus, Marcus, 258-261, 262 n.
- Muzzarelli, Giovanni, 213.
- NAHARRO, Bartolome de Torres, 215 n.
- Namatianus, Rutilius, 270.
- Naples, The Viceroy of, *see* Cardona.
- Nardini, Michele, 355.
- Navagero, B., 192, 223 n., 233.
- Neroni, Alessandro, 105.
- Nicolas V., Pope, 134, 184, 211, 266, 268, 367 n., 376.
- Nicolo di Padua, Fra, 82 n.
- Nifo, Agostino, 250, 273 *seq.*
- Nobili, Guglielmo de', 217 n.
- Novellus, Fr., 124 n., 126 n.
- Numai, Cristoforo, Cardinal, 458.
- ODET de Foix, *see* Lautrec.
- Oliverotto, *see* Uffreducci.
- Oricellario, Simon, 466.
- Orléans, Jean d', Cardinal (Archbishop of Toulouse), 11 *seq.*, 14, 457 n.
- Orley, Bernhard van, 295.
- Orsini, Family of the, 158, 478, 480.
- „ Alfonsina, 108, 174.
- „ Camillo, 6, 8 n., 174 n.
- „ Franciotto, Cardinal, 115, 159, 457.
- „ Roberto Latino (Archbishop of Reggio), 108, 478.
- Ottaviani, 321 n.
- PACIOLO, Luca, 274.
- Pagnini da Lucca Sante, 252 n.

- Palladio, Bloisio, 190, 212 n., 225 n., 227.  
 Pallavicini, Giambattista, Cardinal, 458.  
 „ Sforza, Cardinal, 461.  
 Palonio, Marcello, 211, 212 n.  
 Pandolfini, Francesco, 108, 376 n.  
 „ Giannozzo, 73 n., 115 *seq.*  
 „ Niccolò, Cardinal, 115, 457.  
 Panvinio, Onofrio, 365.  
 Paolucci, Alfonso, 7 n., 9 n., 156 n., 171.  
 Parisi, Pier Paolo, 274.  
 Parisio, Giampaolo [Aulus Janus Parrhasius], 273, 274.  
 Parmenio, Lorenzo, 265, 443 n.  
 Passerini, Family of the, 105.  
 „ Giulio, 104.  
 „ Silvio, Cardinal, 8, 115, 457.  
 Patras, The Archbishop of, 396.  
 Paul III., Pope, 69, 194, 449, 483, 485, *see* Farnese.  
 „ IV., Pope, 469, *see* Carafa.  
 Pazzi, Pietro de', 104, 220.  
 Pellegrino da Modena, 322, 326 n.  
 „ Fabrizio, 8 n., 22 n., 446 n., 479.  
 Penni, Giovanni Francesco, 119, 282, 287, 289, 300, 301 n., 302, 321 *seq.*, 345.  
 Perugino, Pietro, 285, 347.  
 Perusco, Mario de, 385.  
 Peruzzi, Baldassare, 75 n., 118 *seq.*, 140, 152, 168, 171, 367, 379.  
 Pesaro, Pietro, 135 n., 137 n., 138.  
 Pescara, Marchese de, *see* Avalos.  
 Petrucci, Alfonso, Cardinal, 5, 84, 97, 113 *seq.*, 173.  
 Petrucci, Raffaello (Bishop of Grosseto), Cardinal, 457.  
 Piccolomini, Giovanni, Cardinal, 457.  
 Pico della Mirandola, Gianfrancesco, 199, 250, 406 *seq.*  
 Pico della Mirandola, Pandolfo, 102 n., 174 n., 331 n., 340.  
 Pier Maria da Pescia [Tagliacarne], 356.  
 Pighinucci, Tommaso, 229 n.  
 Pimpinelli, Vincenzo (poet), 211, 212 n., 227.  
 Pindar, 118.  
 Pio, Alberto (Count of Carpi), 34, 138, 140, 199, 253.  
 Piombino, 344.  
 Piombo, Sebastiano del, 72, 115 n., 119, 140, 193, 343-347, 351.  
 Pisani, Francesco, Cardinal, 458.  
 Piso, Jacopo, 448.  
 Pistofilo, 41 n.  
 Pius II., Pope, 103, 105, 397, 423, 431.  
 „ V., St., Pope, 432.  
 „ VII., Pope, 299.  
 „ IX., Pope, 299 n.  
 „ X., Pope, 381 n.  
 Plock, Bishop of, *see* Ciolek.  
 Pocalera, Ant. de, 124 n.  
 Poggio, Giovanni Francesco, 106, 153 n., 271 n.  
 Pomponazzi, Pietro, 238, 249 *seq.*, 292 n., 389.  
 Pontormo, Jacopo da, 343.  
 Ponzetti, Ferdinando, Cardinal, 63, 91, 104, 115, 457.  
 Porcari, Camillo (poet), 211.  
 Portugal, The King of, *see* Emmanuel.  
 Porzio, Camillo (Bishop of Teramo), 227 *seq.*, 272 n., 274.  
 Postumo, *see* Silvestri.

- Prato, Giovanni Andrea, 179  
*seq.*  
Prierias (Silvestro Mazzolini),  
252.  
Pucci, Antonio (Bishop of Pistoia), 50, 108, 391.  
,, Lorenzo, Cardinal, 63,  
69 n., 90, 92, 96, 100  
*seq.*, 104, 113, 376 n.,  
415, 457.  
  
QUERNO, Camillo, 153 *seq.*, 156,  
275 n.  
Quirini, Fr., 457 n.  
  
RAGGIO, 399.  
Rallo, Manilio, 261, 262 n.  
Rangoni, Ercole, Cardinal, 101,  
106, 115, 172, 190 n., 458.  
Raphael, 70, 72 *seq.*, 75 n., 91  
n., 100, 112, 115, 119-121,  
130, 136, 139 *seq.*, 148,  
150, 165 n., 172, 192, 195  
*seq.*, 215, 244-249, 264,  
279, 281-289, 293 *seqq.*,  
297-303, 306 n., 308, 310,  
312-319, 321-325, 329,  
332-345, 347, 353, 355,  
360-367, 370 *seq.*, 373,  
378 n., 379-383, 479.  
Recanati, The Lord of, 5.  
Reinhard, Martin, 453.  
Reuchlin, Johann, 75 n., 256.  
Rhadino, Tommaso (O. P.), 252.  
Riario, Girolamo, 165.  
,, Raffaello, Cardinal, 98  
n., 186, 386.  
Ricasoli, Family of the, 101,  
105.  
Ridolfi, Luigi, 63, 110 n.  
,, Niccolò, Cardinal, 69  
n., 101, 110, 115,  
122, 457.  
,, Piero, 110.  
Robbia, della, Family of the,  
317.  
,, Andrea della, 357 n.  
  
Röist, Kaspar, 62 n., 65 n., 67 n.  
Romano, Giulio, *see* Giulio  
Romano.  
Rosis, Francesco de, 195 n.,  
266.  
Rossi, Luigi de', Cardinal, 74,  
110, 115, 122, 457, 475  
*seq.*  
Rovere, Domenico della, 129.  
,, Francesco Maria della  
(Duke of Urbino),  
7 n., 44, 57, 66, 84.  
,, Sisto Gara della, Car-  
dinal, 222 n.  
Rucellai, Giovanni, 11, 14, 219  
*seq.*  
  
SABEO, Fausto, 266.  
Sabino, Pietro, 243.  
Sadoletto, Giulio, 113.  
,, Jacopo, Cardinal, 22,  
106, 140, 184, 191,  
195 n., 197 *seqq.*,  
205, 223 n., 227-  
230, 233, 242, 259,  
267 n., 270 n., 276  
n.  
Saffa, Stefano [l'Eremita], 8 n.  
Saint-Marceau, 3, 15 *seq.*  
Salamanca, Bishop of, *see* Boba-  
dilla.  
Sallajo, Leonardo, 344.  
Salomoni, Mario, 180, 263 n.,  
274.  
Salviati, Giovanni, Cardinal, 69  
n., 101, 109, 115,  
122, 172, 457, 476.  
,, Jacapo, 63, 109.  
,, Lucrezia, *see* Medici,  
Lucrezia.  
Sanga, Giovanni Battista (poet),  
113, 211, 242.  
Sangallo, Antonio di, 69, 140,  
357, 358, 365 *seq.*,  
379.  
,, Francesco di, 115 n.,  
352, 357.

- Sangallo, Giuliano di, 100, 127,  
140, 359, 360, 361  
n., 363, 365 *seq.*,  
470.
- Sannazaro, Jacopo, 202-204,  
279.
- Sanseverino, Antonio, Cardinal,  
457 n.
- „ Federigo de, Car-  
dinal, 159.
- „ Roberto di (Count  
of Cajazzo), 109.
- Sansovino, Cardinal, *see* Ciocchi.
- „ Andrea, 140, 189,  
351 *seq.*
- „ Jacopo, 131, 140,  
379.
- Santi di Cola Sabba, 355.
- Sanuto, Marino, 101, 238 *seq.*
- Sarpi, Paolo, 369 n.
- Sarto, Andrea del, 72 n., 343.
- Sauli, Bandinello, Cardinal, 113  
*seq.*
- Savonarola, 179, 449.
- Savoy, Duke of, *see* Charles.
- Saxo, Janus Hadelius, 216.
- Saxony, The Elector of, *see*  
Frederick (The Wise).
- Schinner, Matthæus, Cardinal,  
50, 52 *seq.*, 55.
- Schönberg, Giberti von, 88.
- „ Nicolas von (Arch-  
bishop of Capua),  
23, 53, 88, 448.
- Scriboni, Dom. (Bishop of  
Imola), 406.
- Sebastiano del Piombo, *see*  
Piombo.
- Seitz, Ludwig, 326 n.
- Selim I., The Sultan, 10.
- Serapica, Giovanni Lazzaro, 92  
*seq.*, 106, 185.
- Seripando, Cardinal, 461.
- Serlio, Sebastiano, 365 *seq.*
- Severiano, Ettore, 5.
- Severino (the physician), 66.
- „ Girolamo, 102 n.
- Sforza, Ascanio Maria, Cardinal,  
159.
- „ Maximilian (Duke of  
Milan), 36, 42, 55.
- Sigismund (King of Poland),  
39, 438.
- Signorelli, Luca, 343.
- Silvanus (Germanicus), Caius,  
216, 248 n.
- Silvestri, Guido Postumo, 161  
n., 162, 214.
- Simone, Giulio, 275 n.
- Simon Peter (Maronite Patri-  
arch), 402 *seq.*
- Sixtus IV., Pope, 61, 96, 103,  
127, 165, 271,  
431, 434.
- „ V., Pope, 85 n.
- Slageck, Dietrich, 452, 454.
- Soddoma, 118, 140, 343.
- Soderini, Francesco, Cardinal,  
113 *seq.*, 130.
- Sophianos, Nic., 261 n.
- Spagnolo, *see* Mantovano.
- Spannoch, The (bankers), 120.
- Spinola, Lanfranco, 172.
- Stadion, Christoph von (Bishop  
of Augsburg), 412.
- Staffileo, Giovanni, 11.
- Stobeo, Giovanni, 262.
- Strascino, *see* Campani.
- Strozzi, Family of the, 101,  
120.
- „ Filippo, 104, 108, 121.
- „ Lorenzo, 121 *seq.*
- Sture, Sten, 451 *seq.*
- Sustenius (humanist), 216.
- TAGLIACARNE, *see* Pier Maria da  
Pescia.
- Tarasconio, Evangelista, 155 n.
- Tasso, Torquato, 202 n.
- Tebaldeo, Antonio, 149, 185,  
195, 213 n., 215, 340.
- Teodoro of Scutari, 449.
- Teutleben, Valentin von, 102 n.
- Thomas de Vio, *see* Cajetan.



- Thüngen, Conrad III. von  
(Bishop of Würzburg), 412.  
Tizio, Sigismondo, 102 n., 180  
*seq.*  
Tocco di Arta, 83.  
Tolmezzo, Franc., 133 n., 135 n.,  
137 n.  
Tolosani, Giovanni Maria, 399.  
Tornabuoni, Family of the,  
105.  
„ Julianus de', 107 n.  
„ Simon de', 107 n.  
Tortona, Bishop of, *see* Zazi.  
Trani, The Archbishop of, 387 n.  
Trémouille, Louis de la, 428.  
Treves, The Elector of, *see*  
Greiffenclau.  
Trevigi, Sebastiano da, 124.  
Tribolo, il [Niccolò Pericoli],  
352.  
Trissino, Giangiorgio (poet),  
218 *seq.*, 242.  
Trivulzio, Agostino, Cardinal,  
458.  
„ Scaramuccia, Cardi-  
nal, 61, 458.  
Trolle, Gustav (Archbishop of  
Upsala), 451 *seq.*  
Turini da Pescia, Baldassare,  
101, 104, 106, 115 *seq.*,  
153, 376 n.  
UFFREDUCCI, Lodovico, 4, 5.  
„ Oliverotto, 4.  
Urban II., Pope, 332.  
Urrea, Pedro, 9 n.  
VAGA, Perino del, 322, 326 n.,  
331 *seq.*, 345.  
Valdo, Agosto, 273 n.  
Valeriano, Pierio [Giampietro  
Bolzani], 191, 224, 243.  
Vallati, Lorenzo (poet), 168,  
211.  
Valle, Andrea della, Cardinal,  
457.  
Varano, Giovanni Maria da,  
58, 109.  
Vasari, Giorgio, 73 n., 282, 297,  
300, 321 *seq.*, 326, 342,  
366.  
Velius, Caspar Ursinus, 216.  
Veralli, G. B., 225 n.  
Vespucci, Giovanni, 108.  
Vettori, Francesco, 67, 99, 108,  
178, 460.  
Vicenzio da San Gimignano,  
322, 326 n.  
Vich, Raymond de, Cardinal,  
458.  
Vida, Marco Girolamo, 190,  
199-203, 279.  
Vincent (Bishop of Skara), 453.  
Vinci, Leonardo da, 116, 337,  
341 *seq.*, 358 n., 380 n.  
Vincidor, Tommaso, 303, 322.  
Vio, Thomas de, *see* Cajetan.  
Vitale, Jano (poet), 214.  
Vitellius, *see* Ciolek.  
Vitruvius, 244, 249, 364.  
Volpato, Giovanni, 321 n.  
WATT, M. v., 127 n.  
Welser, The (bankers), 120.  
Wied, Hermann von (Elector  
of Cologne), 20.  
Wolsey, Thomas, Cardinal, 13  
n., 47, 49 n., 56, 65 n.,  
439-442, 444, 458.  
XIMENES, Cardinal, 266, 368,  
412.  
ZAZI, Joan. Domin. (Bishop of  
Tortona), 423, 425.  
Ziegler, Jakob, 398 n.  
Zuccherro, Taddeo, 332.  
Zurlo, G., 320 n.












## Date Due

AY 20 198

09 1992

WELLESLEY COLLEGE LIBRARY



3 5002 03160 5913

BX 955 .P35 8

Pastor, Ludwig, 1854-1928

The history of the popes,  
from the close of the



